DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 485 UD 035 908

AUTHOR	Higbee, Jeanne L., Ed.; Lundell, Dana Britt, Ed.; Duranczyk, Irene M., Ed.
TITLE	Multiculturalism in Developmental Education. CRDEUL Monograph.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota, 333 Appleby Hall, 128 Pleasant Street, S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455. Tel: 612-626-8706.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Curriculum Development; Developmental Stages; *Diversity (Student); Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; *Student Development; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Achievement Gap; Developmental Curriculum; Learner Centered Instruction

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers is intended to help make connections between multicultural education and developmental education. The papers include an introduction by Jeanne L. Higbee and: "The Centrality of Multiculturalism in Developmental Education" (Karen L. Miksch, Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, Rashne R. Jehangir, and Data Britt Lundell); "Walking the Talk: Using Learning-Centered Strategies to Close Performance Gaps" (Donna McKusick and Irving Pressley McPhail); "Creating Access through Universal Instructional Design" (Karen S. Kalivoda); "Multicultural Legacies for the 21st Century: A Conversation with James A. Banks" (Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, and Dana Britt Lundell); "Is There a Role for Academic Achievement Tests in Multicultural Developmental Education?" (Thomas Brothen and Cathrine Wambach); "The Triumphs and Tribulations of a Multicultural Concerns Committee" (David L. Ghere); "MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC): Sharing Diversity" (Ghafar A Lakanwal and Holly Choon Hyang Pettman); "Summary Report on the Third National Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education: Grants, Research, Diversity, and Multiculturalism" (Dana Britt Lundell); and "Report of the Future Directions Meeting Multicultural Themes Track" (Jeanne L. Higbee and Holly Choon Hyang Pettman). (Papers contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 485

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Lundell
CRDEUL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Multiculturalism in Developmental Education

The fourth annually published independent monograph sponsored by the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Jeanne L. Higbee
Dana Britt Lundell
Irene M. Duranczyk
Editors

Holly Choon Hyang Pettman
Assistant Editor

Karen A. Bencke
Cover Design & Layout

UD 035 908

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Center for Research
on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy

Multiculturalism in Developmental Education

Jeanne L. Higbee
Dana Britt Lundell
Irene M. Duranczyk
Editors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Holly Choon Hyang Pettman
Assistant Editor

UNIVERSITY
OF MINNESOTA

Copyright © 2003 by the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

This publication/material can be made available in alternative formats for people with disabilities. Direct requests to Dana Lundell, General College, 333 Appleby Hall, 128 Pleasant Street SE, Minneapolis, MN, 55455, 612-626-8706.

Printed on recycled and recyclable paper with at least 10 percent postconsumer material.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Introduction 1
Jeanne L. Higbee

The Centrality of Multiculturalism in Developmental Education 5
Karen L. Miksch, Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, Rashné R. Jehangir, and Dana Britt Lundell

Walking the Talk: Using Learning-Centered Strategies to Close Performance Gaps 15
Donna McKusick and Irving Pressley McPhail

Creating Access Through Universal Instructional Design 25
Karen S. Kalivoda

Multicultural Legacies for the 21st Century: A Conversation with James A. Banks 35
Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, and Dana Britt Lundell

Is there a Role for Academic Achievement Tests in Multicultural Developmental Education? 43
Thomas Brothen and Cathrine Wambach

The Triumphs and Tribulations of a Multicultural Concerns Committee 51
David L. Ghere

MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC): Sharing Diversity 59
Ghafar A. Lakanwal and Holly Choon Hyang Pettman

Summary Report on the Third National Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education: Grants, Research, Diversity, and Multiculturalism 63
Dana Britt Lundell

Report of the Future Directions Meeting Multicultural Themes Track 69
Jeanne L. Higbee and Holly Choon Hyang Pettman

Appendices

Publication Announcements 77

Call for Submissions, *Best Practices for Access and Retention in Higher Education* 79

Editorial Board

Karen S. Agee
University of Northern Iowa

Mesut Akdere
University of Minnesota

David Arendale
University of Minnesota

Carol Bader
Georgia College and State University

Hunter Boylan
Appalachian State University

Melanie Brown
University of Minnesota

Martha E. Casazza
National-Louis University

Carl Chung
University of Minnesota

MaryAnn K. Crawford
Central Michigan University

Irene M. Duranczyk
University of Minnesota

Chitralekha Duttagupta
Arizona State University

Shevawn B. Eaton
Northern Illinois University

Michelle Andersen Francis
Jamestown Community College

Patricia R. Grega
Xavier University of Louisiana

Randall Gwin
Minneapolis Community and Technical College

Earl J. Hawley
College of DuPage

Leon Hsu
University of Minnesota

Ellen Lewin
Minneapolis Community and Technical College

Holly Littlefield
University of Minnesota

James Long
Solano Community College

Patricia Malinowski
Finger Lakes Community College

Cynthia Martin
Community College of Denver

Patricia J. McAlexander
The University of Georgia

Caron Mellblom
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Karen Miksch
University of Minnesota

Randy Moore
University of Minnesota

Michael O'Hear
Indiana-Purdue-Ft. Wayne

Audrey Mike Parker
Davidson County Community College

Elana R. Peled
Harvard University

Susan M. Perlis
Marywood University

Susan Schaeffer
Washington State University

E. Stone Shiflet
University of South Florida

Bailey Smith
University of La Verne

Judith K. Taylor
Northern Kentucky University

Linda R. Thompson
Harding University

Karen S. Uehling
Boise State University

Maria Valeri-Gold
Georgia State University

Kathy Wellington
Metropolitan State University

William G. White, Jr.
Grambling State University

Ann A. Wolf
Metropolitan State College of Denver

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Jeanne L. Higbee
Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy
General College, University of Minnesota

For at least six decades (Arendale, 2002), developmental education programs and services in the U.S. have provided means to create access and enhance retention for populations of students that traditionally have been underrepresented in higher education (Hardin, 1988, 1998). Yet multiculturalism has seldom been addressed explicitly in our research and publications. Four years ago Pat Bruch and I conducted an exhaustive literature review on intersections between multiculturalism and developmental education in preparation for conducting an exploratory study within our own developmental education unit (Bruch & Higbee, 2002). When our electronic search yielded no results, we faulted the search engine and went directly to the source. Issue by issue, we examined the tables of contents for four of the primary journals in the field for the past 10 years. What we found were a smattering of articles related to serving students with a variety of disabilities, a few articles discussing English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, and an occasional mention of diverse learners or "minority" students, but virtually nothing related to multicultural learning and teaching. Meanwhile, the literature published by some other professional organizations with somewhat overlapping missions and goals (e.g., the *Journal of College Student Development*, a publication of the American College Personnel Association) is rich with articles addressing issues of race, religion, ethnicity, social class, gender, home language, age, sexual orientation, and disability as they pertain to higher education.

Let me make it clear that it is not our professional association's journals or their editorial staffs that are to be faulted for this dearth of multicultural articles. Those of us working in developmental education who have the luxury of allocated research time and are rewarded for our publication records can only blame ourselves—and I put myself at the top of the list—for failing to establish multiculturalism as a priority in our research and writing. Karen Miksch, one of our colleagues in the General College whose work is represented in this collection, coined a phrase two years ago that creates for me a visual image of the rightful place of multiculturalism in our work. Her vision, expressed in words, conceptualized "the centrality of multiculturalism in developmental education." This phrase offers a promise that is yet to be realized within our profession. The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL) hopes that this monograph will serve as an impetus for making explicit connections between multicultural education and developmental education, not just in the practice of developmental education, but in its research and publications as well.

Monograph Contents

The first three chapters of this monograph provide models for integrating multiculturalism in developmental education. The monograph begins with "The Centrality of Multiculturalism in Developmental Education," by Miksch, Bruch, Higbee, Jehangir, and Lundell, which highlights the Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT) recently undertaken by a subcommittee of the General College's (GC) Multicultural Concerns Committee (MCC). The next chapter, "Walking the Talk: Using Learning-Centered Strategies to Close Performance Gaps," reminds us of the saying popularized in the 1960s at the height of the Civil Rights movement, "If you talk the talk, you better be prepared to walk the walk." McKusick and McPhail provide specific ideas for enhancing academic achievement among all students through a learning-centered model for

developmental education. In "Creating Access Through Universal Instructional Design," Kalivoda discusses a recent model for inclusion for students with disabilities, and through her research findings addresses potential attitudinal barriers to implementing this model.

The remaining chapters in this monograph focus on conversations related to multiculturalism in developmental education, reported by our colleagues in the General College. The work of these authors reflects GC's efforts to implement its multicultural mission. "Multicultural Legacies for the 21st Century," by Bruch, Higbee, and Lundell, captures what began as an interview but evolved into a conversation with Dr. James A. Banks, a leading scholar in the field of multicultural education. "Is There a Role for Academic Achievement Tests in Multicultural Developmental Education?" continues another conversation, as Brothen and Wambach respond to Moore, Jensen, Hsu, and Hatch's (2002) "Saving the 'False Negatives': Intelligence Tests, the SAT, and Developmental Education," published in a previous CRDEUL monograph. Ghere's chapter, "The Triumphs and Tribulations of a Multicultural Concerns Committee," focuses on another conversation, documenting how a developmental education unit can facilitate the integration of multiculturalism in its work through the committee structure. Lakanwal and Pettman's description of the "MultiCultural Development Center: Sharing Diversity" illustrates how these conversations can be expanded to embrace many constituencies and lead to local, regional, and national collaborations between higher education institutions and community organizations.

The final chapters of the monograph are intended to serve as proceedings for the Third National Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education, sponsored by CRDEUL in November, 2002. It is hoped that the conversations initiated at that meeting will be ongoing and result in recognition of the centrality of multiculturalism in developmental education in our programs and services; our individual teaching, research, and writing; and in our professional associations' conferences and publications. Building upon this mission, we encourage you, the reader, to submit related manuscripts for consideration for publication in CRDEUL's upcoming monograph, *Best Practices in Access and Retention in Higher Education*, for which the call for submissions is available at the end of this publication.

Acknowledgments

As editors, Dana, Irene, and I would like to acknowledge the following individuals who made this publication possible. First, we wish to express our appreciation to David Taylor, Dean of the General College, and Terence Collins, GC Director of Academic Affairs, for their continued financial and moral support of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy and this monograph series. We also want to thank Holly Choon Hyang Pettman for her work as Assistant Editor for this project, and Karen Bencke, who has provided the cover design, layout, and formatting for each of the four monographs published to date in the CRDEUL series. We express our appreciation to the authors whose work is represented here for their attention to detail and timely responses to all deadlines. We also want to thank the members of our editorial board for their efforts in conducting the anonymous review of these manuscripts and providing helpful feedback in a professional and punctual manner. The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy also wishes to recognize the contributions of the following local, regional, and national leaders in the field of developmental education and learning support, who gave up a weekend last November to participate in the Future Directions Meeting: David Arendale, Carol Bader, Lois Bollman, Nancy Bornstein, Hunter Boylan, Thomas Brothen, Patrick Bruch, Martha Casazza, David Caverly, Herbert Chambers, Frank Christ, Carl Chung, Terence Collins, Mary Deming, Irene Duranczyk, Shevawn Eaton, David Ghere, Susan Hashway, Leon Hsu, Nancy Hugg, Walter Jacobs, Rashné Jehangir, Karen Kalivoda, Ann Ludlow, Barbara Lyman, Ross MacDonald, Karen Miksch, Randy Moore, Jane Neuburger, Emily Miller Payne, Holly Choon Hyang Pettman, Bruce Schelske, Sharyn Schelske, Norman Stahl, Gretchen Starks Martin, David Taylor, and Cathrine Wambach.

On a personal note, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to express my gratitude to the members of the General College's Multicultural Concerns Committee, not only for their unflagging efforts to create an inclusive learning and working environment, but for assisting me in finding my niche during my first four years in GC and making it feel like home. And finally, I would like to dedicate this monograph to the memory of my mother, Charlotte Margaret Higbee, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

others like her who fought the good fight when it was not only not politically correct to do so, but when taking a stand could have dire consequences both professionally and personally.

References

Arendale, D. R. (2002). Then and now: The early years of developmental education. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 18*(2), 5-23.

Bruch, P. L., & Higbee, J. L. (2002). Reflections on multiculturalism in developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 33*(1), 77-90.

Hardin, C. J. (1988). Access to higher education: Who belongs? *Journal of Developmental Education, 12*(1), 2-4, 6, 19.

Hardin, C. J. (1998). Who belongs in college: A second look. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *Developmental education: Preparing successful college students* (pp. 15-24). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.

Moore, R., Jensen, M., Hsu, L., & Hatch, J. (2002). Saving the "false negatives": Intelligence tests, the SAT, and developmental education. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Exploring urban literacy and developmental education* (pp. 47-57). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Centrality of Multiculturalism in Developmental Education: Piloting the Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT)

Karen L. Miksch, Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, Rashné R. Jehangir, and Dana Britt Lundell
University of Minnesota

This chapter provides a definition of multicultural education and explains why multiculturalism is central to developmental education. Having established theoretical aims, it then describes efforts to centralize multiculturalism via the Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT). MAP IT is a pilot project developed at a four-year public research university with the goal of integrating developmental and multicultural education. As the acronym indicates, its aim is transformative. The chapter concludes by outlining a process to bring about a multicultural transformation in developmental education.

This chapter provides a definition of multicultural education and explains why multiculturalism is central to developmental education. Having established our theoretical aims, we then describe our efforts to centralize multiculturalism via the Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT). MAP IT is a pilot project developed at a four-year public research university with the goal of integrating developmental and multicultural education. As the acronym indicates, our aim is transformative. We conclude by outlining the process through which we hope to bring about a multicultural transformation in developmental education.

The Centrality of Multiculturalism

To explain how multiculturalism is central to developmental education, first we must define what we mean by multicultural education. Often the terms diversity and multiculturalism (or multicultural education) are used interchangeably. However, we consider these to be distinct concepts, each of which is significant to the MAP IT Project.

Defining Diversity

Diversity signifies the simple recognition of the existence of different social group identities. For us, diversity includes a wider variety of social groups than race and ethnicity alone. Social group identifications such as home language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, social class, age, and disability, as well as race and ethnicity, are included within our definition. Numerous social science research studies provide evidence that admitting a diverse student body enhances learning for all students (Astin, 1993; Chang, 1999; Gurin, 2002; Maruyama, Nirebim, Gudeman, & Marin, 2000). Likewise, several recent court decisions relying

on social science research determined that admitting students who belong to one or more of these categories is critical to the mission of higher education (Miksch, 2002). There is also growing evidence that diversity initiatives have increased the numbers of historically underrepresented students on many campuses (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998; Smith & Schonfeld, 2000). However, fulfilling the promises of access and equity involves moving beyond diversity to multicultural education.

Defining Multiculturalism

If diversity is an empirical condition—the existence of multiple group identities in a society—multiculturalism names a particular posture towards this reality. There are many definitions of multiculturalism and multicultural education. We build on the work of James Banks (2001), who defines multicultural education as, "an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process" (p. 2):

> As an idea, multicultural education seeks to create equal educational opportunities for all students, including those from different racial, ethnic, and social-class groups. Multicultural education tries to create equal educational opportunities for all students by changing the total school environment so that it will reflect the diverse cultures and groups within society and within the nation's classrooms. Multicultural education is a process because its goals are ideals that teachers and administrators should constantly strive to achieve. (p. 2)

What is important to us about Banks' definition is that it explicitly moves beyond recognition of different social group membership (i.e., diversity) to advocate a method for transforming educational institutions so that they might more fully enable the participation of all citizens within our multicultural society. Exemplifying this transformative method, Lee Anne Bell and Pat Griffin (1997) advocate sequencing learning activities so that students move from a personal understanding of social group identity (e.g., diversity training) to an institutional or structural approach to social justice (multicultural education). According to Bell and Griffin, programs concerned with diversity focus on "helping students describe and understand their own experiences as members of different social groups and listen to others talk about their experiences and perspectives. The focus is on respecting, understanding, and acknowledging difference" (p. 55). The next step is to move toward a multicultural learning approach. "The concepts of dominance, social power and privilege are introduced to help students understand that difference is not neutral, that different social groups have greater or lesser access to social and personal resources and power" (p. 55). At this point, students are ready to deal with cultural and structural levels of inequality.

Ideally, multicultural education strives to build on the strengths and avoid the weaknesses of diversity plans. Evelyn Hu-DeHart (2003) eloquently critiques campus diversity plans that do not address cultural and institutional inequities. She notes:

> differences are described as "natural," hence normal and fixed; their main role is to provide positive experiences . . . [campus diversity plans] advise all of us who are different to learn to get along; we must help to create a "climate of healthy diversity," in which "people value individual and group differences, respect the perspectives of others, and communicate openly." In other words, diversity means good manners, now called civility, another key component of the corporate model that has pervaded our campuses. Nowhere does this definition state, or even hint or imply, that differences are socially and historically constructed and hierarchically arranged. Nor does it allow that most differences carry real and differential meanings regarding power and privilege. This corporate model lays the entire burden on individuals and their attitude and behavior, while absolving the institution of any responsibility for dealing with itself. It does so by studiously avoiding discussion of the structural inequalities that some of the itemized differences embody and convey, by failing to distinguish between individual and group differences, and by stressing the role of civility above all else in creating a diverse environment. (p. 2)

Multicultural education, as opposed to the diversity programs that Hu-DeHart describes, critically engages systems of hierarchy and institutional privilege that are often left out of notions of individual diversity and civility. Thus, within multicultural education the focus is on "several forms of difference [for example, race,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

class, home language, gender, sexual orientation, disability] that also define unequal positions of power in the United States" (Sleeter & Grant, 2003, p. iv). The emphasis on the links between forms of diversity and relations of power is the main factor differentiating multicultural education from diversity training.

The transformative agenda of multicultural education moves beyond celebrating diversity to providing meaningful access to all students. Multicultural education, described as transforming access, builds on the work of Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant (2003) who advocate "Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist" (p. 195):

> Education that is Multicultural means that the entire educational program is redesigned to reflect the concerns of diverse cultural groups. Rather than being one of several kinds of education, it is a different orientation and expectation of the whole educational process . . . . The phrase Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist is adopted by educators who want to identify with a more assertive and transforming educational position. (p. 195)

Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist deals directly with structural inequality and prepares all involved to transform society so that it better serves the interests of all groups, especially those groups who historically have been marginalized. The goal is to promote structural equity and cultural pluralism. Instruction, while involving students actively in decision making, builds on diverse learning styles and is collaborative. Further, it incorporates the skills and knowledge that students bring to the classroom.

Building on the insights of Sleeter and Grant (2003) and Hu-DeHart (2003), our view is that multicultural education must extend beyond the classroom and provide an agenda of transformation for better understanding the institution in terms of whom it includes and what it tries to accomplish. In other words, meaningful multiculturalism seeks to transform more than just the curriculum; it seeks to transform the institution. As Patrick Hill (1999) notes, "while the presence of persons of other cultures and subcultures is a virtual prerequisite to the transformation, their 'mere presence' is primarily a political achievement" (p. 228). It is not enough to add a requirement that each student take a diversity course in order to graduate, or to sprinkle multicultural courses throughout the curriculum. Hill argues, "marginalization will be perpetuated, if new voices and perspectives are added while the priorities and core of the organization remain unchanged" (p. 228). Rather than focusing exclusively on diversity and classroom issues, the work of higher education must be "reconceived to be unimplementable without the central participation of the currently excluded and marginalized" (Hill, p. 228). Developmental education, with its overt access mission, is situated to contribute to the reconceptualization of higher education in ways that see the participation of the currently marginalized and excluded as a central concern.

The Role of Developmental Education in Promoting Multiculturalism

Developmental education programs are well positioned to help institutions rethink their priorities because they provide access to groups of students who have historically been underrepresented. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) projected in 2002 that by the year 2012 there would be a 15% increase in the number of students enrolled in degree-granting institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Currently, women, adult students, and students of color are providing the greatest enrollment growth (Jehangir, 2002). According to the NCES National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (U.S. Department of Education, 2000), low-income students are more likely to take "remedial" courses than middle and upper income students. During the 2000 school year, a higher percentage of students of color than White students took remedial courses. As Rashné Jehangir (2002) notes, however:

> The overlap between developmental students and students of color, students with disabilities, and adult students is made not to equate developmental education with these groups but to suggest that developmental education plays a role in creating access to public higher education. (p. 22)

The overlap between developmental students and diverse students is just one reason multicultural education must be made central to developmental

education. As Patrick Bruch and Jeanne Higbee (2002) have argued, multicultural education offers to developmental educators the enabling insight that inequities of group power that obstruct access for many developmental students are not timeless truths that people are powerless to change. Instead, power relations are "socially constructed and maintained through revisable personal and institutional practices" (p. 77). The difficulty, Bruch and Higbee note, is that very little research has been done to determine how multicultural theory can be applied and turned into practice in the field of developmental education. The MAP IT Project is one attempt to fill that gap.

The Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation

The Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation has culminated in a comprehensive set of guiding principles and survey instruments designed to underscore the centrality of multiculturalism in higher education. The 10 Guiding Principles for Multicultural Awareness and Institutional Transformation (Miksch, Higbee, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, & Barajas, 2003) are reproduced as Figure 1. The Guiding Principles incorporate both notions of diversity and multiculturalism. The principles define diversity broadly to include home language, sexual orientation, and disability, as well as race, ethnicity, religion, social class, age, and gender. These principles go beyond advocating for diversity to include our understanding of multicultural education. Thus, the Guiding Principles include the links between forms of diversity and relations of power and advocate for meaningful access to higher education for all students. The survey is divided into three instruments: one for faculty and instructional staff, another for administrators, and a third for advisors and other student support service staff members (Miksch, Higbee, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, Siaka, & Dotson, 2003). Each set of questions relates to a particular principle and measures either attitudes about the principle or implementation of the principle.

The MAP IT Guiding Principles and survey instruments are an adaptation of *Diversity Within Unity: Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society* (Banks et al., 2001). *Diversity Within Unity* endorsed 12 essential principles for successful primary and secondary school systems (K-12). Also included in the report is a checklist designed to be used by K-12 practitioners to determine the extent to which their institutions and environments are consistent with the essential principles. The purpose of MAP IT was to adapt *Diversity Within Unity* for use in institutions of higher education.

MAP IT is a subcommittee of the Multicultural Concerns Committee (MCC), an ad hoc committee within a developmental education unit. The MCC was founded in 1989 to promote the unit's overt multicultural mission and the MAP IT project is a continuation of the committee's work to bring about meaningful multiculturalism within developmental education. Dr. James Banks, lead author of *Diversity Within Unity*, gave permission to the MCC to both adapt the *Diversity Within Unity* principles and to pilot a survey in a developmental education program to see how to use the checklist at institutions of higher education.

Our first step was a literature review to determine if there were existing instruments for use in higher education. Although we reviewed a number of existing studies, most were aimed at measuring campus climate, professional development, or commitment to multiculturalism individually, rather than combining these measurements in one instrument (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002). Most of the existing instruments were geared for use with faculty or students, and none of the existing instruments were geared for use with faculty, administrators, advisors, and student support staff. We also reviewed the literature on multicultural education within developmental education journals and within the general field of education and determined that much of the existing literature and studies were related to K-12 education. Thus, we decided that a comprehensive set of guiding principles and a survey instrument geared to institutions of higher education was needed.

Working collaboratively, we went line-by-line through the *Diversity Within Unity* checklist, and adapted the language to make it applicable to higher education. In February 2002 when our pilot survey was complete, we sent an e-mail communication to all unit employees, asking them to complete the MAP IT Pilot Survey online. A paper and pencil version of the survey was also made available to all faculty and staff. Each set of questions allowed the respondent to type in a narrative response. A request for comments on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 1. MAP IT 10 Guiding Principles For Institutions of Higher Education.

Institutional Governance, Organization, and Equity

1. The educational institution should articulate a commitment to supporting access to higher education for a diverse group of students, thus providing the opportunity for all students to benefit from a multicultural learning environment.

2. The educational institution's organizational structure should ensure that decision making is shared appropriately and that members of the educational community learn to collaborate in creating a supportive environment for students, staff, and faculty.

Faculty and Staff Development

3. Professional development programs should be made available to help staff and faculty understand the ways in which social group identifications such as race, ethnicity, home language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, social class, age and disability influence all individuals and institutions.

Student Development

4. Educational institutions should equally enable all students to learn and excel.

5. Educational institutions should help students understand how knowledge and personal experiences are shaped by contexts (social, political, economic, historical, etc.) in which we live and work, and how their voices and ways of knowing can shape the academy.

6. Educational institutions should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively within a multicultural educational community.

7. Educational institutions should enable all students to participate in extracurricular and co curricular activities to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enhance academic participation and foster positive relationships within a multicultural educational community.

8. Educational institutions should provide support services that promote all students' intellectual and interpersonal development.

Intergroup Relations

9. Educational institutions should teach all members of the educational community about the ways that ideas like justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity are valued by many cultures.

Assessment

10. Educational institutions should encourage educators to use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess student learning.

Adapted for higher education from:

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington. Available at: http://depts.washington.edu/centerme/cenpub.htm

overall pilot survey was also provided at the end of the instrument.

The online Pilot Survey responses were analyzed by the MAP IT team and incorporated into the final MAP IT survey instruments. The revised series of survey instruments are each shorter than the pilot questionnaire, and geared toward three major employment categories (i.e., instructors, student services, and administration) to reflect the feedback received. A parallel student survey has also been developed (Miksch, Higbee, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, Siaka, & Dotson, 2003). In addition to using the pilot data to improve the survey instrument, the authors have also completed quantitative and qualitative analyses of the responses (Bruch, Jehangir, Lundell, Higbee, & Miksch, 2003; Higbee, Miksch, Jiang, Jehangir, Lundell, & Bruch, 2003.).

MAP IT Quantitative Results

The faculty response rate for this study was 65% (n=21), and the professional and academic (P&A) staff response rate was 50% (n=25). Other employment categories (e.g., civil service staff, graduate assistants) had significantly lower response rates. Although it is important to be cautious when drawing conclusions based on such a small sample, overall the results of the MAP IT Pilot Study were very positive. For example, in response to the question, "Do admissions policies allow for enrollment of students from diverse backgrounds?" the mean was 4.70 on a five-point Likert-type scale where 5 signified "always or almost always," and 1 indicated "almost never or never." For another question that asked, "Are students given opportunities to have meaningful contact with students from diverse groups?" the mean was 4.21. "Are the students taught about how stereotyping and categorization can result in prejudice and discrimination?" yielded a mean response of 4.20. The mean response for "Is advocacy around multicultural issues central to the student services mission?" was 4.41. Items yielding lower means included:

1. "Do faculty, staff, and students set ground rules together to engage in meaningful and safe dialogue around difference?" (M=3.70).

2. "Does GC provide appropriate role models for all students?" (M=3.50).

3. "Do teaching strategies accommodate diverse student interests and learning styles?" (M=3.80).

4. "Do faculty and staff in GC help students to acquire the social skills that are needed to interact effectively within a multicultural educational community?" (M=3.83).

5. "Do students have a role in decision making in GC?" (M=2.52).

These items pointed out some very specific ways in which the General College could improve its teaching, learning, and working environment for all of its constituencies.

Items that referred to institutional policies tended to yield lower means than similar items that addressed General College procedures and practices. For example, the mean for "Do University of Minnesota policies encourage the use of multiple ways of assessing student learning that are culturally sensitive and that measure complex cognitive and social skills?" was 2.82. Meanwhile, when asked, "Does assessment within the General College go beyond traditional measures of subject matter knowledge to include critical thinking?" the mean was 3.86.

The members of the Multicultural Concerns Committee are in agreement that the quantitative data from the MAP IT Pilot Survey did not yield many surprises. What is important is what the General College chooses to do with this data. Concrete steps can be taken to address the areas in which improvement is needed.

MAP IT Qualitative Results

In addition to the quantitative prompts, the MAP IT checklist offered GC respondents a place (i.e., a box in the online format) to type in open-ended comments related to each set of questions. This was included as a means to gain feedback both about the usefulness of the survey tool itself and participants' feedback and insights about the content of each of the main principles. The data was thematically examined to identify "discussion points" for further conversation, to be used as a launching point for members of the community to converse about the Guiding Principles.

In an article presenting the results of the project's qualitative analysis (Bruch, Jehangir, Lundell, Higbee,

& Miksch , 2003), the relationship of the participants' voices and viewpoints to one another within the context of the community itself was specifically examined. This included a visual diagram recognizing the interaction of two overarching themes or participant vantage points called "Location" and "Ideology" that were used to view the "Principles and Practices" in the community around multiculturalism. "Location and Ideology" are the ways that individuals perceive themselves in relation to the principles, practices, and power in their academic community, as well as how they construct the purposes of education in society. This provided a theoretical framework for an interpretation of the comments where they could be framed as discussion points for conversation and change rather than merely as discreet analytical themes. This led to thematic concepts such as "employment," "knowledge about the issues," and "proximity to power" as some key ways in which individuals provided their own reading of the principles and survey questions within the Location and Ideology framework.

An outcome of the qualitative analysis, in addition to identifying these concepts and themes, was to put forward these discussion points for future conversation, specifically noting that conversations about the "right" way to promote the principles should become more situated within a context and viewed in relation to the perspectives of other individuals in the community as meanings about multiculturalism are negotiated.

The MAP IT Process

In order to bring about meaningful transformation we realized it was crucial to present the quantitative and qualitative findings to the community so that conversations of respect could continue within the developmental education unit. Dr. James Banks met with the members of MCC in May 2002 to discuss the preliminary results of the pilot study. He encouraged us to disseminate the pilot results and make the survey instrument widely available. At the forum with Dr. Banks, all members of MCC were invited and provided valuable feedback on the instrument. During Fall 2002 we presented our findings at an open meeting to all members of the developmental education unit.

In order to engage in a conversation with other developmental educators, we also presented our results at the annual College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) conference in Minneapolis (Bruch, Miksch, Lundell, Jehangir, & Higbee, 2002) and the annual conference of the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE; Higbee & Lundell, 2003).

The MAP IT pilot project also resulted in a number of areas for future discussion within the developmental education unit where it was tested. The results underscored the need for an ongoing conversation about the meaning of multiculturalism and what kind of access we are hoping to provide. We do not expect to reach one definition of multicultural education and access. Rather, through constructive controversy (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 2000), we hope to work together to transform the institution. What role students should play in decision making within the developmental unit is another area in which we hope to facilitate an ongoing dialogue. Student voices and perspectives must be included in the multicultural transformation process. One formal way we plan to include students is by administering and discussing a student survey incorporating the 10 Guiding Principles for Institutional Transformation (Higbee & Dotson, 2003; Miksch, Higbee, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, Siaka, & Dotson, 2003).

As the discussion above illustrates, our use of the MAP IT Guiding Principles and survey instruments within the developmental education unit where we work is ongoing. Too often, diversity surveys are conducted, reports are written, yet nothing is done with the results. For meaningful transformation to take place, it is crucial that as developmental educators we continue an ongoing dialogue about the centrality of multiculturalism in higher education.

Conclusion

How will we make multicultural education central to developmental education? What will the transformed institution look like? It is more than just making sure all voices have access and are heard, although this is critical. Institutions should be concerned with "neutralizing the impact of unshared power in teaching and research" (Hill, 1999, p. 229). MAP IT attempts not only to neutralize the impact of unshared power, but also to help teachers and learners transform their institutions. With that in mind, MAP IT highlights three stages of multiculturalism (Bruch, Miksch, Lundell,

Jehangir, & Higbee, 2002; Bruch, Jehangir, Jacobs, & Ghere, 2003). The first phase is celebratory multiculturalism, where the focus is on tolerance and celebration of diversity. Critical multiculturalism is the next stage and reveals group domination and privilege. The final step is transformative multiculturalism. MAP IT will provide developmental educators with one tool to help accomplish that transformation.

The goal is to redefine higher education and work toward meaningful access. We do not advocate a top-down approach, imposed by the administration. Although it may accomplish important gains, there is often a backlash. Rather, we advocate a multicultural approach to institutional transformation, a process that will be inclusive, process oriented, and continuous.

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Diversity Web: An interactive resource hub for higher education.* Retrieved March 1, 2002, from: http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W01/interculturalism.html

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on campus: How are students affected? *Change, 25,*(2) 44-49.

Banks, J. A. (2001) Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks, & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.) (pp. 1-26). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Jordan Irvine, J., Nieto, S., Ward Schofield, J., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, School of Education, University of Washington.

Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (1997). Designing social justice education courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 44-58). New York: Routledge.

Bruch, P. L., & Higbee, J. L. (2002). Reflections on multiculturalism in developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 33*(1), 77-90.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R., Jacobs, W., & Ghere, D. (2003). *Enabling access: Toward multicultural developmental curricula.* Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Higbee, J. L., & Miksch, K. L. (2003). *Preaching to choirs or listening and learning: Multicultural institutional transformation.* Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Bruch, P. L., Miksch, K. L., Lundell, D. B., Jehangir, R. R., & Higbee, J. L. (2002, November). *Multiculturalism for the 21st century: The Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT).* Paper presented at the 35th Annual Conference of the College Reading and Learning Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter? The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40,* 377-395.

Gurin, P. (2002). *Evidence of the educational benefits of diversity in higher education: Response to the critique by the National Association of Scholars of the expert witness report of Patricia Gurin in Gratz v. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger.* Retrieved March 3, 2002, from the University of Michigan, Information on Admissions Lawsuits Web site: http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/new/gurin.html

Higbee, J. L., Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., & Miksch, K. L. (2003). The multicultural mission of developmental education: A starting point. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 19*(2), 47-51.

Higbee, J. L., & Dotson, M. V. (2003). *Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT) student questionnaire.* Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee and Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Higbee, J. L., & Lundell, D. B. (2003, February). *The Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT).* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for Developmental Education, Austin, TX.

Higbee, J. L., Miksch, K. L., Jiang, F., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., & Bruch, P. L. (2003). *Assessing our commitment to providing a multicultural learning experience.* Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Hill, P. J. (1999). Multiculturalism: The crucial philosophical and organizational issues. In B. A. Pescosolido & R. Aminzade (Eds.), *The social worlds of higher education: Handbook for teaching in a new century* (pp. 220-231). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.

Hu-DeHart, E. (2003). The Diversity Project: Institutionalizing multiculturalism or managing differences? [Electronic version]. *Academe, 86*(5). Retrieved January 1, 2003, from: http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/00so/SO00TOC.htm

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pederson, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(3), 279-302.

Jehangir, R. R. (2002). Higher education for whom? The battle to include developmental education at the four-year university. In J. L. Higbee, D. B. Lundell, & I. M. Duranczyk (Eds.), *Developmental education: Policy and practice* (pp. 17-34). Auburn, CA: National Association for Developmental Education.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2000). Constructive controversy: The educative power of intellectual conflict. *Change, 32*,(1), 28-38.

Maruyama, G., Nirebim, J. F., Gudeman, R. H., & Marin, P. (2000). *Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors.

Miksch, K. L. (2002). Legal issues in developmental education: Diversity as a key element of the educational mission. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 19*(1), 55-61.

Miksch, K. L., Higbee, J. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Bruch, P. L., & Barajas, H. L. (2003). *Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT) 10 guiding principles for institutions of higher education* (rev. ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee and Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Miksch, K. L., Higbee, J. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Bruch, P. L., Siaka, K., & Dotson, M. V. (2003). *Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation: MAP IT.* Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee and Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, D. G., & Schonfeld, N. B. (2000). The benefits of diversity: What the research tells us. *About Campus, 5*(5), 16-23.

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Projections of education statistics to 2001.* Washington, DC: Author.

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2000). *1999-2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.* Washington, DC: Author.

Walking the Talk: Using Learning-Centered Strategies to Close Performance Gaps

Donna McKusick
Irving Pressley McPhail
The Community College of Baltimore County

The learning paradigm provides a useful framework for insuring the academic success of underserved and underprepared diverse populations by emphasizing a constructivist philosophy and learning outcomes assessment. This chapter presents research-based best practices in closing the achievement gaps between majority and minority students and traces the journey of one learning-centered institution to close the achievement gap between African American and White students. Five strategies are addressed: (a) using professional development to retrain faculty and staff; (b) providing responsive, culturally-mediated instruction, (c) using culturally-attuned methods for academic preparation, (d) customizing student support services, and (e) creating a welcoming institutional climate.

A quiet revolution has been going on in colleges across the country. Institutions of higher education are shifting their focus from the institution to the learner. According to Barr and Tagg (1995), "Subtly but profoundly we are shifting to a new paradigm: A college is an institution that exists to produce learning. This shift changes everything" (p. 13). The learning paradigm distinguishes itself from the instructional paradigm in a number of ways that are important to serving the needs of diverse learners (Barr & Tagg). The essential nature of knowledge and the learning process are challenged in the learning paradigm. Whereas, in the instructional paradigm, knowledge is viewed as an absolute entity outside of the life of the learner, in the learning paradigm, knowledge is shaped by, constructed from, and connected to each learner's background. In the learning paradigm, learning is a process in which knowledge is "nested" and connected rather than accumulated and stored. In the learning paradigm, learning environments are cooperative and collaborative, rather than individualistic and competitive. Finally, and most important, in the learning paradigm, talent and ability are abundant in all individuals. To quote Smilkstein (2002), "We're born to learn!"

The Learning College and At-Risk Students of Color

The tenets of the learning paradigm have an important relationship to the future of developmental students in the United States, who are becoming more culturally and ethnically diverse every day. In the beginning of the 1990s, about a third of developmental students were minorities (specifically African American and Hispanics), with the largest group as African Americans (Boylan, Bonham, Claxton, & Bliss, 1992). According to a recent study of developmental education by McCabe (2000), 20% of African American students enrolled in community colleges have *seriously* deficient skills; that is, they are placed in developmental reading, writing, *and* math, and assigned to a lower-level remedial course in at least one area. Only 5% of White students, however, come to community colleges with seriously deficient skills.

According to the U. S. Bureau of the Census (2001), in the next 50 years, minority populations including African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, and Asians will increase as the White population decreases. African American and Hispanic students are more likely

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to be underserved by secondary and postsecondary institutions than are White students (McCabe, 2000). The Education Trust (2001), a nonprofit agency concerned with improving the education of populations who have been historically disenfranchised in the American school system, reports that by 12th grade, African American and Hispanic students in the American public school system are about four years behind other people on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Gaps in performance between African American students and White students continue into postsecondary institutions (Harvey, 2002). The Education Trust's research shows that African-Americans obtain college degrees at only half the rate of White students. The reasons for these gaps are many. Low expectations, lack of standards, lack of accountability, poor teaching, communication problems, and failure to address the specific learning styles of culturally and ethnically diverse students all appear to be major factors in perpetuating the performance gap between these students and White students (Education Trust, 2001; McPhail & McPhail, 1999).

To insure success for these students, institutions must do more than talk about multiculturalism. The learning paradigm asserts not only that all students can learn, but also that it is the institution's responsibility to help all learners connect with knowledge to construct meaning. In order to do this, the institution must better understand the cognitive learning preferences of all learners, which may differ according to culture (Hollins, 1996; Hoover, 1982; Irvine & York, 2001; McPhail & McPhail, 1999; Shade, Kelly, & Oberg, 1997). These differences may involve communication style, social interaction style, response style, or linguistic style (Shade, Kelly, & Oberg) and may be represented by difference in views about individualism, concepts of time, ideas about social hierarchies, and orientation to change (Education Research Service, 2003). For example, many African American learners prefer to (a) process knowledge within its context rather than in isolated parts; (b) use inferential reasoning rather than deductive or inductive reasoning; (c) perceive approximate quantities rather than exact quantities; (d) learn about people rather than things; (e) use active learning activities that incorporate freedom of movement; (f) learn in collaborative, social situations, and (g) learn visually and kinesthetically (Education Research Service; McPhail & McPhail; Shade, Kelly, & Oberg). Learning preferences such as these can be used to create learning environments that produce success for all learners.

Applying the Principles

LearningFirst

How do institutions apply the principles of the learning-centered paradigm to performance gaps? The Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC), named as one of 12 Vanguard Learning Colleges by the League for Innovation in the Community College, has named its strategic plan LearningFirst. This plan is characterized by an articulated belief system that the institution: (a) makes learning its central focus, (b) makes students active partners in the learning process, (c) creates holistic environments that support student learning, (d) ensures that every member of the college community is a learner, (e) focuses on learning outcomes to assess student learning and success, and (f) assumes final responsibility for producing student learning.

In everyday practice, these beliefs mean that CCBC applies two questions to every institutional decision: "Does it improve learning?" and "How do we know?" (O'Banion, 1997). Answers to these questions are determined at all levels through institutional research, learning outcomes assessment, and classroom assessment.

Defining the Gaps at CCBC

In exploring the learning outcomes of developmental students in 2001, CCBC uncovered unacceptable gaps in performance between African American and White students for course pass rates, retention rates, graduation rates, and transfer rates. In general, at the course level, the differences in pass rates between White Students and African American students were largest for students taking developmental courses, ranging from approximately 10% to 20%, depending on the developmental discipline and level. This is significant because a disproportionate number of African American students enroll in developmental courses. Although only 25% of the students at CCBC are African American, 40% of the students enrolled in developmental courses are African American.

At the 100 course level, a 12% gap existed between the pass rates of African American and White students; at the 200 course level, a 7% gap existed. Gaps of 3% (part-time) and 4% (full-time) occurred between African American and White students' fall semester to spring semester retention rates; gaps of 4% (part-time) and 8% (full-time) occurred with fall to fall retention rates. Four-year graduation rates showed a gap of 10%, and four-year transfer rates revealed a gap of 14%.

Taking Action

The LearningFirst philosophy of CCBC asserts that until *all* learners are successful, the institution has not yet made good on the promise of access and opportunity. To make this promise a reality, the institution began to address performance gaps in two intersecting populations of "at promise" students, its African American students and its developmental students. It also assumed an important institutional stance early on, consistent with the learning paradigm: rather than seek to "fix" its students, the institution would work by itself and in tandem with the elementary-secondary (K-12) system to "fix" itself so that it could better serve the needs of its learners. After conducting a review of best practices, the institution constructed a vision statement and a mission statement for its Closing the Gap Initiative.

> *Vision statement.* CCBC produces improved and expanded learning outcomes that reflect no difference in achievement between African American and White learners. (CCBC Catalogue, 2002-2004)

> *Mission Statement.* CCBC offers, through all segments of its institution, an organizational culture, a responsive methodology of instruction, and an array of student services that address the needs of all learners, with particular attention to those students who have been historically disenfranchised in the American education system. CCBC actively promotes a responsive and diverse organizational culture by attracting, retaining, and supporting a faculty, staff, and student community that reflect the diversity of the region it serves. CCBC further responds in its various learning environments by providing students with learning experiences that embrace the cultural backgrounds of all students. CCBC maintains high expectations of all learners and assists them with an array of academic and personal support services such as developmental education, tutoring, mentoring, and advising to ensure success. CCBC also works actively with K-12 schools to promote academic readiness of high school students. Finally, in keeping with its role as a learning college, CCBC is outcomes driven in all efforts to close the achievement gap among groups of diverse learners and to promote continuous institutional improvement. (CCBC Catalogue, 2002-2004)

Furthermore, CCBC established strategies that would focus on five areas: professional development, instruction, academic preparation, student services, and institutional culture. All of these interrelated areas have direct bearing on the success of diverse developmental students.

Learning-Centered Strategies for Closing the Gaps

Professional Development

Effective professional development is the first tool that institutions can use to build a coalition for change (Boylan, Bonham, & Bliss, 1993; Boylan, Saxon, White, & Erwin, 1994). At the minimum, all learners, regardless of level, need faculty and staff who have adequate experience, subject-matter expertise, and classroom effectiveness (Haycock, 2003). In addition, however, institutions need to provide opportunities for faculty and staff to grow in their understanding of the effects of race and culture on teaching and learning. This staff development includes workshops on racial identity (Tatum, 1997), faculty mentoring and training in pedagogical techniques to address the varied learning styles of a diverse student body, and instruction in revamping the curriculum so that it is relevant to a multicultural society (Banks, Cookson, Gay, Hawley, Irvine, Nieto, Schofield, & Stephen, 2001). In particular, faculty can be trained in the techniques of culturally-mediated instruction (Hollins, 1996) and in what Banks and Banks (1995) have named "equity pedagogy," "teaching strategies and classroom environments that help students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to function effectively within, and help create and perpetuate, a just, humane, and democratic society" (p. 152). More is said about culturally-mediated instruction later in this chapter.

Applying professional development strategies. In accordance with its belief that every member of the college community is a learner, in the summer of 2002 CCBC held a Symposium on Closing the Gap. The purpose of this event, which was voluntarily attended by 350 faculty and staff, was (a) to create a sense of urgency in participants by presenting institutional data on performance gaps, and (b) to begin to create a guiding coalition for institutional transformation. These two techniques are necessary for getting institutional change started (Kotter, 1996). Powerful and effective speakers challenged the myth that socio-economic reasons were accountable for the gap (Education Trust, 2001). Faculty were praised for their ability to produce change in the classroom, were exposed to new pedagogies such as culturally-mediated instruction (Hollins, 1996), and were challenged to adapt their instruction to better meet the needs of all learners. At the end of the symposium, faculty and staff who attended were invited to submit "powerful ideas" they obtained from the day. Below is a sampling of the numerous responses.

From a reading professor: "From the talk, I would like to use more visual graphic organizers to teach strategies for handling the different reading tasks involved in discipline specific textbooks." From a literacy instructor:

> I was extremely impressed with the presentation on voluntary and involuntary minorities and the phenomenon of "cultural inversion." For me, it provided the missing factor in the whole discussion of the "learning gap." I see now how crucial this concept is to any remedy for solving this intractable problem.

From a biology professor:

> One powerful idea I derived from the day is that students are looking for instructors that are willing to "connect," meaning, without being too pushy or too personal, instructors should help their students to succeed or help to find the reason(s) for lack of success.

Since the original symposium, the institution has continued to hold conferences, workshops, and departmental discussions about addressing the needs of diverse learners. New faculty members participate in a year-long learning community in which they discuss instructional approaches that are effective for all learners.

Instruction

Because increased learning is the ultimate goal of the learning college, and because the student-teacher relationship is fundamental to learning, what happens in the classroom is at the heart of closing the gap. Learning facilitators need a caring attitude and an ability to communicate with all learners (Gonsalves, 2002), regardless of diverse sociolinguistic communication patterns (Delpit & Dowdy, 2002). The ability to further connect with learners can be enhanced by an understanding of brain-based learning (Smilkstein, 2002), a theory which suggests that to construct new learning, new ideas must be linked to prior learning and exercised through practice. To build curricula around this learning model necessitates an understanding of the many varying worldviews and prior cultural background knowledge brought to the classroom by diverse learners. The curriculum should be transformed to reflect the histories and perspectives of all people (Banks et al., 2001), and should be adapted to make learning relevant to the lives of all learners through contextualization and application to everyday life (Hoover, 1982; McPhail & Morris, 1986; Moses, 2002; Schoenfeld, 2002). Classroom assessment practices that help the instructor gauge student response lead to instructional modification (Cross & Steadman, 1996). The result, culturally-mediated instruction, can be used to address the learning styles and backgrounds of all learners (Hollins, 1996; Hoover, McPhail, & Ginyard, 1992; McPhail & McPhail, 1999) This fine tuning of instruction to make it responsive and relevant to lives of learners is most effective in a small class environment (Roach, 2001). High expectations, expressed explicitly to all students, coupled with institutional accountability, guarantee that instruction is on track (Education Trust, 2001; Hrabowski, 2002).

Applying instructional strategies. CCBC faculty have been involved in study groups to learn how to facilitate learning in a culturally-mediated manner. The following

list summarizes specific research-based techniques instructors have been using to relate better to diverse learners:

1. Make a personal connection with each student.

2. Communicate high expectations to each student, and assure students that you believe they can meet these expectations.

3. Listen "through the dialect" to better hear what the student is really saying.

4. Explain to students that dialects, regionalisms, and speech patterns reflect cultures and are not inherently right or wrong. Explain directly to students that although no language pattern is better, Standard American English may be necessary to succeed in this country.

5. Do more visual presentation in class; present a more visual overview of the content by using more graphic organizers.

6. Use works that represent many cultures and belief systems.

7. Use a number of pedagogies—some direct instruction, some individual work, some group work, and lots of active learning opportunities to address the cultural learning needs of all students.

8. Be more intentional in the make-up of small groups, putting together students of different cultural backgrounds.

9. Create zones for safe discussion of racial issues in each class.

10. Monitor daily what is working with students through classroom assessment and adjust activities to benefit students who appear not to be "getting it" from the "planned" activities.

Academic Preparation

Reaching back to feeder high schools to provide assessment and early intervention helps boast students' skills before they enroll in college (McCabe, 2000). Research has also provided postsecondary institutions with many best practices that can be used in the developmental classroom to hone the basic skills of underprepared students from historically underrepresented populations. In general, the use of mastery learning provided within a highly structured learning environment is recommended because of its effectiveness with all developmental learners (Boylan & Saxon, 1999). Students who are academically underprepared should be provided with many instructional delivery choices that address their particular cultural learning styles. An active, contextualized, small group methodology that characterizes culturally-mediated instruction is particularly beneficial for African American learners (Hollins, 1996; Hoover, McPhail, & Ginyard, 1992). Developmental learning communities provide opportunities for students to contextualize learning with topics related to diversity (Boylan & Saxon, 1999; Hollins, 1996; Hoover, McPhail, & Ginyard, 1992; Moses, 2002; Stahl, Simpson, & Hayes, 1992; Tinto, 1997).

Language skills. The principles of culturally-mediated instruction can be easily applied to meet the specific needs of underprepared students. One valuable method that addresses the cultural learning style of African American students is the Nairobi Method (Hoover, McPhail, & Ginyard, 1992). This method of literacy instruction originated in 1969 at a community-oriented independent African American college in California called the School of Wisdom and Knowledge, and has been used in a variety of settings including developmental programs. The approach uses the background of learners to provide a platform from which students can grow and learn. As opposed to many developmental programs that are individualized, this program recognizes the preference of many African American learners for group learning by promoting active, collaborative, and participatory instruction. For example, vocabulary building activities include practicing word patterns with partners, using corrected dictation with partners, and group paraphrasing. A semi-foreign language approach is used in reading instruction because many diverse learners bring with them a dialect or another language in addition to Standard American English. Knowledge of English orthography and structural analysis is used to build vocabulary, while daily controlled composition on generative themes is used to improve writing.

Math skills. The work of Robert Moses (2002) provides an example of how to culturally mediate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instruction in basic math. Linking issues of math and science literacy to the ongoing struggle for citizenship and equality for African Americans, Moses initiated the Algebra Project in McComb County, Mississippi in 1982. The project taught algebra, a crucial stepping-stone to college level math, to middle school students. Moses' instructional model begins with a physical trip, even if it is just walking students around the block. Next, students are asked to create a pictorial representation or construct a model, which includes important features of the event. This starts the process of abstraction. Then, students are asked to use intuitive language about the event, by speaking and writing in their own language. Later, students are trained to use structured language or a common language about the features of the trip. In doing so, four mathematical concepts of the trips are introduced: start, finish, direction, and distance. Finally, the students invent symbols to represent these ideas. These symbols are then manipulated to solve meaningful mathematical problems. Moses' approach takes advantage of meaningful situations, students' own language patterns, and visual representation to help learners connect with mathematics.

Applying strategies that improve academic preparation. In accordance with the LearningFirst principle of making students active learners in the learning process, at CCBC developmental students can participate in special sections that use culturally-mediated instruction. Some of these sections use the framework of a learning community to provide a contextual basis for instruction by combining a developmental reading or writing course and a general education course, such as African American History, Introduction to American Pluralism, Health 101, and Psychology 101. Under normal circumstances, developmental reading and writing are prerequisites for most general education courses, but in the developmental learning communities, developmental students are permitted to enroll in a general education course because they receive extra support. In these communities, the reading or writing instructor uses materials from the textbook of the general education course to teach developmental skills to the students. Students are easily engaged in the learning of the developmental skills because they are using these skills to actively construct meaning in the general education course.

In the learning communities, because students attend several courses together, they are able to bond with each other and use their relationships to benefit their learning. Collaborative activities abound in the communities, providing opportunities for students to connect with each other and to learn cross-culturally from one another. "Border crossings," or opportunities for students to explore another culture, and "safe-zones" for discussions of sensitive racial content provide opportunities for students to establish social trust (Steele, 1999; Tatum, 2000).

One element that makes the program unique is the addition of a Master Learner to each learning community. Master Learners are faculty or counselors who are not experts in the discipline that is being taught in the general education course. After being trained, these individuals spend the semester with the students in the general education course and act as models by attending class regularly, taking notes, completing assignments and tests, and writing papers. In addition, once a week the Master Learners run a required seminar for the students; these seminars provide guidance in the skills and behaviors needed to be successful in the course.

Learning outcomes assessments have determined the communities to be a powerful contributor to student retention. The fall to spring retention rate of students in the learning communities is 77%, as compared to the college's average of 66%. The fall to fall rate is 60%, as compared to the college's average of 42%. Grades of students in the learning communities are also routinely higher than grades of other CCBC students in the same courses. These statistics may represent the motivation level of the students who enroll in learning communities. Most important, however, is that the 12% pass rate gap between White students and African American students in all 101 level courses has been reduced to 5% in the learning communities. Assuming that African American and White motivation for enrolling in the learning communities is the same, this reduction in the pass rate gap represents true progress.

Several factors contribute to the general effectiveness of the developmental learning communities. First, the developmental students are working with authentic texts and are motivated to succeed in the developmental course because it will help them with the general education course. Second, the Master Learner is able to provide the instructors with feedback on whether instruction is adequately connecting with the learners. Third, the Master Learner

gets to observe another instructor and to learn from that individual's teaching techniques. Fourth, Master Learners discover materials that they can incorporate into courses in their disciplines. For example, a career/technology instructor was able to incorporate more diversity content in his courses after he was a Master Learner in a pluralism course.

Student Support

A host of specific student support services documented as best practices are used in serving at-risk students of color. To determine which services students most need, affective variables such as motivation, attitude, metacognition, and study skills should be assessed along with basic skills (Archer, 2002). Students need opportunities to build academic skills through tutoring, which is enhanced through cross-cultural tutor training (MacDonald, 1994). In addition, Freshmen Year Experience Programs (Fidler & Godwin, 1994), Summer Bridge Programs (Kulik, Kulik, & Schwalb, 1983), and Orientation Programs (Hackett, 2002) provide students with a community, an orientation to higher education, and a structured learning environment critical for learners who may be the first generation in their families to attend college. Peer counseling (Brown, 1991) and mentoring (Carriuolo, 2001) help students connect with each other and with the institution. Inclusion of family members in campus programs supports students by providing parents with base knowledge about higher education (Fries-Britt, 2002) and by helping the institution learn more about students' backgrounds. Finally, supplemental financial aid programs provide financial access to college for many students who otherwise would not have been able to attend college.

Applying student support strategies. In accordance with the LearningFirst belief that institutions must create holistic environments that support student learning, CCBC has supported its instructional efforts with a host of student supports geared directly to meeting the needs of diverse learners. All developmental reading students are required to enroll in a student success orientation course, Achieving Academic Success (SDEV 101), where an inventory of affective skills in attitude, motivation, learning styles, and study skills is taken and where strategies to meet affective needs are taught. Students in this course develop individualized learning plans, which are web-stored, to guide their progress through the following semesters. Student Success Centers on all campuses provide tutoring and computer-aided instruction by paraprofessional and peer tutors, who are trained in cross-cultural communication. A summer bridge program called the Pre-College Institute enables students to complete developmental courses in a few intensive weeks while introducing them to the campus. Finally, a peer mentoring program matches students who have high grade point averages and recommendations from faculty with African American developmental students. These pairs meet regularly to help the mentees navigate through the new world of higher education.

Institutional Culture

These instructional and student support efforts to close performance gaps produce a culture that celebrates diversity and expects high levels of learning of all students. Affirming identity, building community, and cultivating leadership are mechanisms an institution can use in all of its interactions with learners to transform its culture to one that celebrates high levels of success for all learners (Tatum, 2000). Hiring faculty and staff who culturally represent the institution's learners promotes affiliations between students and faculty, an important retention strategy. Identity affirmation is enhanced through the establishment of cultural centers, clubs, programs, and activities that make obvious the institution's commitment to students of all races and cultures. Special programs that foster and celebrate the high achievements of students of color encourage enrollment of academically accelerated students of color who can provide examples and mentorships for underprepared students (Fries-Britt, 2002; Hrabowski, 2002). Through the creation of "safe zones," faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to "border cross" into other cultural experiences (Tatum, 2000) and to discuss sensitive cultural issues, in order to develop social trust (Banks et al, 2001; Steele, 1999). Institutional climate audits can help an institution know how successful it has been in transforming culture.

Applying strategies to improve institutional culture. In the final analysis, an institutional culture that supports high levels of learning for all students is the ultimate trait of the learning college. At CCBC, all steps to become more learning-centered have included strategies that address institutional culture. CCBC has created an atmosphere for faculty in which pedagogy

is discussed at college, department, and division meetings. A safe-zone for professionals to discuss the role of culture in learning has been established through a college-wide electronic discussion board and campus-based discussion groups. Closing the gap is a consideration in all college plans and garners the attention of everyone through its own strategic plan. Safe zone discussions for students occur in courses across the curriculum, in learning communities, in mentoring sessions, and at campus Multicultural Centers. Special events that feature prominent African American intellectuals and artists speaking on topics such as the hip-hop culture or African geography occur weekly. Student trips to historically Black colleges and universities provide a message to students that CCBC expects them to graduate and transfer on to receive a four-year degree.

Conclusion

Although CCBC has always been welcoming to students of all cultures, it has only recently begun its intentional 10 year journey to close the performance gap between African American learners and White learners. As a Vanguard Learning College, CCBC has discovered that the principles and strategies of the learning revolution provide a perfect framework for colleges to "walk the talk." The principles behind the specific strategies that CCBC is using to close the gap between African American learners and White learners can be used for any performance gap, because they focus on the learner rather than the institution. These include (a) professional development to help learning facilitators better understand the learning needs of diverse students; (b) rethinking instructional delivery systems to include positive representations of the cultural heritage of underserved populations in the curriculum, and informing students about the brain's natural learning process; (c) reaching back to address the academic preparation of students by using culturally appropriate pedagogies; (d) providing students with customized supports that meet the specific needs of diverse learners; and (e) creating an institutional culture that places the highest value on the success of all learners. Through continued assessment of learning outcomes, the compass that helps steer the direction of a learning-centered institution, CCBC will be able to monitor its own progress and make adjustments along the way. Finally, we hope that the determination to "walk the talk" will generate the type of discussion and action planning that will lead to improved practice and documented learning outcomes for all learners.

References

Archer, L. (2002). *A study of institutional responses to community college students with serious deficiencies in reading skills.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD.

Banks, C., & Banks, J. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education. *Theory into practice* (A publication of the College of Education, Ohio State University), *34*, 152-158.

Banks, J., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W., Irvine, J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J., & Stephen, W., (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*, 196-202.

Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27* (6), 13-25.

Boylan, H., Bonham, B., & Bliss, L. (1993). The performance of minority students in developmental education. *Research in Developmental Education, 10* (2), 1-4.

Boylan, H., Bonham, B., Claxton, C., & Bliss, L. (1992, November). *The state of the art in developmental education.* Paper presented at the First National Conference on Research in Developmental Education, Charlotte, NC.

Boylan, H., & Saxon, D. (1999). *What works in remediation: Lessons from 30 years of research.* Unpublished research prepared by The National Center for Developmental Education for The League for Innovation in the Community College. Available: http://www.ncde.appstate.edu/reserve

Boylan, H., Saxon, D., White, J., & Erwin, A. (1994) Retaining minority students through developmental education. *Research in Developmental Education, 11* (3), 1-4.

Brown, C. (1991). Increasing minority access to college: Seven efforts for success. *NASPA Journal, 28*, 224-230.

Carriuluolo, N. (2001). Helping low-income and minority students succeed in college: An interview with Blenda Wilson. *Journal of Developmental Education, 25* (1), 26-28.

Community College of Baltimore County (2002-2004). *Catalogue.* Baltimore, MD: Author.

Cross, P. K., & Steadman, M. H. (1996). *Classroom research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. (Eds.). (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Educational Research Service. (2003). *What we know about: Culture and learning.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Education Trust, Inc. (Spring, 2001). New frontiers for a new century: A national overview. *Thinking K-16,* 5 (2). Available: www.edtrust.org

Fidler, P., & Godwin, M. (1994). Retaining African-American students through the Freshman seminar. *Journal of Developmental Education, 17* (3), 34-36, 38, 40.

Fries-Britt, S. (2002). High-achieving Black collegians. *About Campus, 7* (3), 2-8.

Gonsalves, L. M. (2002). Making connections: Addressing the pitfalls of White faculty/Black male student communication. *Journal of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 53,* 435-465.

Hackett, T. (2002). Survival strategies for African-American women in community colleges. *Learning Abstracts, 5* (11), 1-3. Available: http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/learning/lelabs1102.htm

Harvey, W. (2002). *Minorities in higher education 2000-2001, 18th annual status report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Haycock, K. (2003). Toward a fair distribution of teacher talent. *Educational Leadership, 60* (4), 11-15.

Hollins, E. (1996). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hoover, M. R. (1982). A culturally appropriate approach to teaching basic (and other) critical communication skills to Black college students. *Negro Educational Review, 33,* 14-27.

Hoover, M. R., McPhail, I. P., & Ginyard, L. (1992). Literacy for miseducated Black adults: The Nairobi method, a culturally appropriate approach. In A. M. Scales & J. E. Burley (Eds.), *Perspectives: From adult literacy to continuing education* (pp. 212-218). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Hrabowki, F. (2002). Postsecondary minority achievement: How to raise performance and close the achievement gap. *The College Board Review, 195,* 40-47.

Irvine, J. J., & York, D. E. (2001). Learning styles and culturally diverse students: A literature review. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 484-497). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kulik, G-L. Kulik, J., & Schwalb, B. (1983). College programs for high risk and disadvantaged students: A meta-analysis of findings. *Review of Educational Research, 53,* 397-414.

MacDonald, R. (1994). *The master tutor.* Williamsville, NY: Cambridge Stratford Lt.

McCabe, R. H. (2000). *No one to waste.* Washington, D. C.: Community College Press, American Association of Community Colleges.

McPhail, I. P., & McPhail, C. (1999, September). Transforming classroom practice for African-American learners: Implications for the learning paradigm. *Removing vestiges: research-based strategies to promote instruction,* Washington, DC: American Association for Community Colleges.

McPhail, I. P., & Morris, P. L. (1986). A new look at reading/communication arts in the inner-city junior high school. *Reading Improvement, 23,* 49-60.

Moses, R. (2002). *Radical equations: Math literacy and civil rights.* Boston, MA: Beacon.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century.* Phoenix, AZ: Onyz Press.

Roach, R. (2001). In the academic and think tank world, pondering achievement-gap remedies takes center stage. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 18* (1) 26-27.

Schoenfeld, A. (2002). Making mathematics work for all children: Issues of standards, testing, and equity. *Educational Researcher, 31*(1), 13-25.

Shade, B., Kelly, C., & Oberg, M. (1997). *Creating culturally responsive classrooms.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Smilkstein, R. (2002). *We're born to learn.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. E., & Hayes, C. G. (1992). Ten recommendations from research for teaching high-risk college students. *Journal of Developmental Education, 16* (1), 2-4, 6, 8, 10.

Steele, C. (1999). Thin ice: "Stereotype threat" and Black college students. *The Atlantic Monthly, 284* (2), 44-47, 50-54.

Tatum, B. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria and other conversations about race.* New York: Basic Books.

Tatum, B. (2000). The ABC approach to creating climates of engagement on diverse campuses. *Liberal Education, 86* (4), 22-30.

Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 68* (6), 599-623.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (2001). Census Data. Washington, D.C. Public Information Office.

Creating Access Through Universal Instructional Design

Karen S. Kalivoda
University of Georgia

This purpose of this qualitative study was to apply the Theory of Planned Behavior to understanding faculty attitudes toward the use of Universal Instructional Design in the college classroom. This study explores the beliefs, attitudes, and behavior of faculty toward Universal Instructional Design while providing examples of ways to enhance the learning environment for students with disabilities. The Theory of Planned Behavior was used to provide a theoretical framework for the individual faculty interviews and for the analysis of data. Utilization of the theory provided information about common objections to universally designed curricula and appropriate methods of intervention to influence faculty behavior.

The passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act has contributed to the rapid growth of educational opportunity for students with disabilities at institutions of higher education. A recent survey found that 9% of freshmen self-reported having a disability (Henderson, 1999). Now that one in eleven full time freshmen report having a disability, campuses are developing policies and practices to provide equal educational opportunity for students with disabilities (Jarrow, 1997).

Faculty members are responsible for providing equal access to students with disabilities in their classes. However, faculty may not be aware of students with documented disabilities in their classrooms unless students relate information about their disability and accommodation needs. Some disabilities are difficult to hide, such as paralysis or visual impairments. Others such as psychological disorders, fibromyalgia, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, learning disabilities, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder may not be so easily observable. Due to the emphasis on standardized testing in many institutions' admissions and placement policies, it is not unusual for students with hidden disabilities, and particularly those with previously undiagnosed learning disabilities, to begin their college experience in developmental education programs or courses (Hardin, 1998). The accommodation needs of students vary just as the type and severity of disabilities vary. Accommodations and modifications, whether architectural, technological, or academic, must meet the individual access needs of each student (Kincaid & Simon, 1994).

Possible classroom accommodations may include allowing a student to tape record lectures, to use a spell checker on written work, and to have access to copies of the lecture outline or a peer's notes. Professors are not obligated to provide adjustments that are excessive or that lower academic standards. The law assures students of reasonable accommodations but does not require faculty to fundamentally alter the nature of the class (Kincaid, 1994). According to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, there are many different types of reasonable accommodations, depending on the nature and severity of the disability, including substitution of required courses, time extensions for tests and assignments, or the provision of a sign language interpreter or Braille text. Federal regulations assert that it is discriminatory to withhold necessary academic accommodations, but faculty members are not always willing to provide them (*Dinsmore v. Pugh and the Regents of the University of California at Berkeley*, 1989; Goodin, 1985; Malouff, 1996).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Universal Instructional Design is a method of instruction that would meet the needs of all students, including addressing many of the accommodation requirements of students with disabilities, as well as considering the diverse learning styles of developmental-education students. The goal of this study is to gain a better understanding of the factors that influence faculty intention to provide Universal Instructional Design in the college classroom and thus improve instruction for all students.

Universal Instructional Design

Universal Instructional Design (UID) involves multi-modal teaching and multi-modal assessment methods to enhance learning for all students. For many students with disabilities, class participation and learning are often hindered by the method of presentation of the material (Waksler, 1996). UID utilizes instructional strategies that address various learning modalities in order to benefit the diverse student body (Higbee, Ginter, & Taylor, 1991). It also incorporates accessible technology into the classroom as a teaching tool. The goal of UID in course development is to be as inclusive as possible, thus meeting the learning needs of more of the student body and reducing the need for "special" academic accommodations for students with disabilities (Silver, Bourke, & Strehorn, 1998).

The UID approach incorporates the needs of all students in the planning and implementation of classroom instructional methods and different evaluative forms. It has been suggested that the use of this approach would considerably reduce the role of faculty and disability service providers in providing accommodations for students with disabilities (Silver, Bourke, & Strehorn, 1998). For the purpose of the study, faculty were provided with the following brief definition and examples of Universal Instructional Design: "Universal design approach encourages teaching environments that meet the needs of all students and may incorporate visual aids, different instructional methods, interactive teaching, computer-assisted instruction and alternative modes of evaluation." It was explained that the overall goal is to create an environment for optimal learning for all students.

Theoretical Framework

Rather than using the traditional attitude measurement approach, this study uses an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1985), as an alternative approach to understanding and predicting specific behaviors. The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) is founded on the belief that people usually make rational decisions based on the information available to them (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). This information includes beliefs regarding the consequences of behavior. Although behavior is based on beliefs, it is not a direct link. According to the theory, beliefs influence the formation of attitudes, attitudes influence intention, and intention is the immediate determinant of behavior. There are two main components of the theory, attitude toward the behavior and subjective norm with respect to the behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Behavioral beliefs are those that underlie a person's attitude toward the behavior. The faculty member's positive or negative evaluation of performing the behavior (i.e., providing Universal Instructional Design) is referred to as attitude toward the behavior. Normative beliefs underlie a person's subjective norm, which is determined by his or her beliefs in regard to the presence or absence of social support for engaging in the behavior in question. A person's beliefs in regard to whether important others think one should or should not perform a specific behavior is referred to as a person's normative belief (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

An extension of the TRA was introduced, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), by Ajzen (1985). The TPB is identical to the TRA except that it takes into account the degree to which individuals are capable of exercising control over the behavior in question. For example, if the performance of the behavior is contingent upon time, money, skills, and the cooperation of other people, then the degree of control a person has over the behavior should be measured. It may be impossible to gain an accurate measure of actual control, but a person's perceived behavioral control is measurable. Perceived behavioral control refers to the degree to which a person believes it is likely to be easy or difficult to perform a behavior. (Ajzen & Madden, 1986). According to the Theory of Planned Behavior, a person's perceived behavioral control, attitude toward the behavior, and subjective norm are the three basic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

determinants of a person's behavioral intention. This study explores the beliefs, attitudes and behavior of faculty toward Universal Instructional Design in the classroom.

Method

Participants

A total of 15 faculty were randomly selected from a pool of faculty that had students with disabilities enrolled in their class in spring semester of 2000. Twelve faculty members agreed to participate in the study, yielding a response rate of 80%. Respondents consisted of four females and eight males. Two thirds of the faculty were tenure-track and tenured from varying faculty ranks. Note that one third held temporary positions. The sample resulted in a representation of 11 different disciplines: Math, Political Science (2), Health and Human Performance, Sociology, History, Geography, Economics, English, Psychology, Classics, and Biological Sciences. A cover letter explaining the study, a questionnaire, and a consent form were sent to the 12 faculty members. All participants were informed that their responses would be confidential, but not anonymous.

Procedures and Instrument Development

The first step of the study was the development of an open-ended interview schedule to identify salient beliefs about the behavior. The interviewer met individually with the participants and asked them to relate their beliefs in regard to providing Universal Instructional Design to students. The questionnaire was constructed as outlined by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). The questions focused on three specific areas: salient behavioral beliefs, referents, and control beliefs.

Elicitation of salient behavioral beliefs. According to the theory, attitude toward the behavior is based on beliefs about the consequences of the behavior. Of specific interest was information about the perceived advantages and disadvantages associated with performing the behavior. In order to collect salient beliefs, faculty members were asked, "What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of providing Universal Instructional Design to students in your class?"

Elicitation of salient referents. According to the theory, information should be gathered about the perceived social support of important others for engaging in the behavior. In order to determine the particular referents for this population, faculty members were asked, "Are there any groups or people who would approve or disapprove of you, providing Universal Instructional Design to students in your class?"

Elicitation of control beliefs. Perceived behavioral control is determined by the extent to which faculty think they have control over the behavior. In order to gather information about control beliefs, faculty were asked, "What things outside of your control might prevent you from providing or make it easier to provide Universal Instructional Design to students in your class?"

Data Analysis

An expert panel was utilized to ensure that the responses to the interview questions were interpreted and coded correctly. This expert panel consisted of faculty, higher education administrators, and professionals who work with students who have disabilities. They compared the original data obtained from the interviews with the coded answers. To ensure that information collected was not distorted or exaggerated, researchers used the reliability suggestions proposed by Whyte (1982).

Results

Behavioral Beliefs

As suggested by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), the responses were content analyzed, and responses that referred to similar outcomes were grouped together, as provided in Figure 1. The respondents indicated 10 different advantages and disadvantages associated with providing Universal Instructional Design to students in their class. Five of the beliefs were specified as advantages, and the other five were identified as disadvantages.

The most frequently mentioned advantage was that providing UID would accommodate diverse learning styles. One faculty member stated, "If Universal

Instructional Design helps disabled students and other students who learn differently, then I will try to incorporate this technique." Another stated, "All students should have access to this [UID], not just the disabled."

The most frequently cited disadvantage was that providing UID would not be fair to all students. One faculty member stated, "Some of these UID ideas are excellent tools, but how do you evaluate equitably when you have different modes of evaluation?" Another participant expressed concerns about challenging the students. He stated, "It would be a disservice to students because it would not prepare them for graduate school or a profession. . . it will make it too easy for students."

Additional advantages that were elicited with a lower frequency included that providing Universal Instructional Design would allow students to benefit from instruction, employ technology as a learning tool, and use various teaching styles. Disadvantages that were reported less often indicated that some faculty believed that providing Universal Instructional Design would - lower academic standards, be inappropriate for certain course content, and compromise the learning experience.

Referents

The group of people most frequently mentioned as showing approval for the behavior was students in class. One faculty member in the College of Arts and Sciences stated, "Students would probably welcome it." He went on to say that students would want anything that "helps them learn and get higher grades." The group of people cited most often as disapproving of the behavior was faculty colleagues. One participant relayed the conflict within her department about employing UID in her classroom. She stated:

> What you described [UID] is part of my teaching philosophy. I am criticized for my instructional style. The grades in my classes are much higher than the norm. I get in trouble if grades are too high—making it too easy. The faculty here think students are dictating how things should be, and it is not so!

This young assistant professor went on to assert that she "looks at the student as a whole person." Another participant concurred with this by stating, "this department is top heavy. . . older and set in their ways.

Figure 1. Advantages of Providing Universal Instructional Design to Students in Class.

Behavioral Beliefs: Advantages	n
Accommodates diverse learning styles	10
Benefits the student	6
Employs technology as a learning tool	5
Uses various teaching styles	4
Personally rewarding to instructor	2
Behavioral Beliefs: Disadvantages	**n**
Unfair to students	7
Lowers academic standards	4
Course content not conducive	4
Compromises the learning experience	4
Requires extra time and effort of faculty	3

There is a huge research interest that most faculty go along with. They are not as interested in teaching or technology."

Other referents who would approve or disapprove included the department head, academic dean, and upper administration. The faculty respondents had very different perceptions of their colleagues, student, and administration. Figure 2 identifies significant others who would approve or disapprove of the behavior.

Control Beliefs

Control beliefs were content analyzed, and similar control beliefs were grouped together, as provided in Figure 3. The inhibiting factors that were most frequently cited were lack of resources and absence of instructional support. Regarding lack of resources, a faculty member stated, " I might be able to try this [UID] if I had teaching assistants to help." Another participant stated, "Universal Instructional Design sounds ideal, but how would I implement it? I never really learned about the ways that students learn. . . I haven't received that instruction." A number of the instructors shared candid opinions about the lack of reward system for teaching. One tenured professor stated, "This talk about valuing teaching is a bunch of lip-service. The reality of this place is that teaching gets the back burner."

When asked what factors would facilitate the use of Universal Instructional Design, a majority of the faculty stated that instructional support and assistance from Disability Services would assist them. Of the 12 participants, 11 highlighted the importance of instructional support. A full professor asked for information on student learning styles. She stated, "When I reflect pedagogically, I try to find ways to open that door to learning. It would be helpful to have information from the literature about what helps people learn." A majority of the participants would rely on the campus instructional support office for technology assistance and course design. A junior faculty member stated, "I would need the instructional support office to help me. I teach the way I was taught and would need some guidance from them."

Incorporating technology in classroom teaching was also a common theme. One faculty member stated, "I'm not electronically sophisticated, and there is a lack of support for technology." Another participant stated,

> Additional technology resources would be helpful. . . I introduce technology that makes access easier to all students. It transfers information in a dynamic way. Although I try to use technology as a teaching tool, it is difficult because there is only one classroom with the available technology. Lots of people compete for that room. I am surprised at the poor teaching facilities available. Technology here is just an extra cost, not a necessary resource.

Subsequent facilitating factors that were mentioned less frequently included a smaller class size and a campus environment that values and rewards teaching. Additional inhibiting factors mentioned less frequently included departmental regulations, heavy teaching loads, and time constraints.

Figure 2. People Who Might Approve or Disapprove of Providing Universal Instructional Design.

Referents	Approve (n)	Disapprove (n)
Faculty colleagues	4	10
Students in class	9	4
Department head	4	2
Upper administration	6	2
Academic dean	2	0

Implications for Developmental Education

Understanding the Theory of Planned Behavior should assist developmental educators in influencing faculty use of UID and thus improve equal opportunity to learning for students with disabilities. Although faculty may desire to provide instruction using Universal Instructional Design methods, factors outside their control may prevent them from doing so. Educators need to identify the beliefs underlying the three components of the Theory of Planned Behavior that may impact the utilization of Universal Instructional Design. Once these are identified, steps can be taken to eliminate potential obstacles to improve teaching.

The Department or Program Chairperson

The majority of respondents indicated that the department chair was someone that may influence their intention to provide UID. It may be beneficial to initiate methods of intervention in collaboration with the department or program chair. As leaders, chairpersons can serve a key role in motivating faculty to improve instruction. Faculty are open to discussions about the teaching process and may respond positively to presentations on alternatives to lecturing, strategies for leading good discussions, and teaching critical thinking skills (Lucas, 1990). Many faculty have not had formal training in how to teach, and the department chair is in a position to impact the quality of college teaching by faculty. Lucas states:

> To enhance teaching effectiveness, department chairs need to (1) recognize that they have both position and personal power to accomplish change, (2) be familiar with some strategies for bringing about change, and (3) have a general sense of the range of issues related to teaching about which faculty should be knowledgeable. (p. 67)

Given that department heads were identified as the most salient referent, training in UID should begin with them. Another approach to educating groups of faculty might be invited presentations at departmental meetings.

Figure 3. Factors that Might Facilitate or Inhibit the Provision of Universal Instructional Design.

Facilitating Control Beliefs	n
Instructional support	11
Assistance from Disability Services	7
Class size	6
Technology	6
Reward system for teaching	4
Inhibiting Control Beliefs	**n**
Lack of resources	10
Absence of instructional support	9
Class size	8
Time constraints	7
Reward system for research	7
Departmental constraints	5
Heavy teaching load	3

Education About UID

Almost all of the participants (83%) specifically mentioned the desire to accommodate diverse learning styles, but some believed providing UID would be unfair to students in their classes. Participant responses consistently reflected a lack of understanding about the definition of UID. A majority of the faculty stated that using UID would be inequitable to students in their class. This belief in unfairness was based on the inaccurate assumption that UID was mainly intended to assist students with disabilities rather than to improve instruction for all students in the class. They also voiced concern about lowering academic standards. Several faculty members expressed that UID would fail to challenge students or prepare them for the "real world." These comments indicate a need for further education about UID, different learning styles, and the diverse student body. Perhaps in the education process, effort should be made to demystify the term, "Universal Instructional Design." Referring to the well respected and commonly accepted "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) would be a clear way to explain some of the concepts of UID.

Another theme was the impression that all the UID concepts had to be used in order to be considered a legitimate user. UID concepts include creating an accessible Web site, lecturing with audiovisuals, providing specific descriptions of visual materials, facilitating group work, and allowing students to demonstrate mastery of the course in a variety of ways. Questions arose about how to realistically employ all the instructional methods at the same time. The thought of using UID to meet the anticipated needs of all learners was stressful. One faculty member stated, "Universal design sounds ideal, but from a practical point of view it would be mind boggling." He explained that using visual materials and handouts to enhance learning for students who are deaf would make it more difficult for students with visual impairments. Designing a course that would successfully meet the individual needs and preferences of all students seemed insurmountable.

Incorporating the concepts of UID is not an "all or none" proposition. Instructors who chose to use multi-modal instruction, or develop an accessible web page, are taking steps toward improving instruction for the diverse student body. Web support is an excellent example of a method to enhance learning for students with a variety of disabilities. For instance, an accessible web page can benefit students who may not be able to see, hear, move or process some types of information easily. In developmental education programs, it is critical to provide further information regarding Universal Instructional Design and its implementation for faculty and graduate teaching assistants, and also for learning center personnel, tutors, and any other staff involved in enhancing learning.

Faculty Development

Faculty indicated a clear need for educational and instructional support from the institution's faculty development office. Improving instruction is one of the core components of instructional development offices (Lucas, 1989), and the development of cooperative relationships with these offices can advance the dissemination of information to faculty about the concepts of UID.

Faculty who think they do not have the resources or knowledge (i.e., perceived behavioral control) to provide UID may rely heavily on this supportive resource. They may understand how the students benefit from UID (i.e., attitude toward the behavior), have the support of the academic department or program head (i.e., subjective norm), and yet hesitate to restructure their course from the traditional method, solely due to lack of knowledge about teaching and learning. On the other hand, the more resources and fewer obstacles faculty members perceive, the greater their perceived control over the behavior.

Instructional development offices in conjunction with disability support offices may offer UID concepts at routine workshops for faculty and graduate assistants. This is an ideal means of communicating with a diverse group of faculty in a limited period of time, but may not be fruitful because it does not address the specific concerns of attendees. Prior to scheduling workshops, it would be helpful to survey faculty regarding their behavioral, normative, and control beliefs about UID. These will vary based on the individual campus climate. Another example of faculty support is currently offered through The University of Minnesota General College "Curriculum Transformation and Disability (CTAD)" grant, funded by the U. S. Department of Education (Fox,

Hatfield, & Collins, 2003; Fox & Higbee, 2002). This model provides faculty education and training about UID and emphasizes the importance of using faculty mentors to conduct outreach to faculty.

Some respondents suggested individualized instructional assistance for faculty. Although time consuming, meeting individually with faculty is an ideal way to address specific behavioral, normative, and control beliefs, and the number of students served may ultimately far outweigh the initial time investment. Conversing one-to-one with faculty can shed light on the reasons why there is hesitation to provide UID. For instance, a meeting with a faculty member can reveal that the assistant professor is going up for tenure review in the near future. This faculty member may have time constraints due to numerous committee obligations and feel pressure from the department head to assume more teaching responsibilities and to increase research productivity. It is understandable that the faculty member may want to delay the initiation of new instructional methods until these other issues are resolved. Faculty who express time pressure yet a desire to provide UID can be introduced to UID concepts that will actually save their time.

It may also prove helpful for instructional support offices and disability services offices to develop and disseminate written materials such as handbooks and periodic newsletters to assist faculty in developing useful UID strategies. Newsletter articles by faculty who are already implementing UID could provide specific ideas as well as conveying the notion that colleagues are supportive of UID efforts. *Curriculum Transformation and Disability: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education* (Higbee, 2003), an outcome of the University of Minnesota's CTAD grant, includes a number of chapters written by developmental educators who have implemented UID in their classrooms.

Faculty Recognition

Some faculty believed that providing UID would demand an unreasonable amount of time for which they would not be rewarded. Institutional policies and procedures can address these concerns by recognizing and rewarding the behavior in the merit, tenure, and promotion processes. A number of participants commented on the research-based reward system. Support for this sentiment is substantiated with data reflecting higher salaries for research and scholarship (Fairweather, 1993). Some institutions have adopted teaching awards, often with a permanent salary increase. However, compensation resulting from annual reviews tends to be more influenced by research performance than teaching (Edgerton, 1993).

Some institutions are trying to change this perception by proposing that the faculty award system be aligned appropriately with the institution's mission and developing institutional policies and practices that support and reward good teaching (Seldin, 1990). Specific recommendations for implementation include annual teaching evaluations of all faculty, improved procedures for formative and summative evaluations of teaching, an integration of research into teaching, and establishing at least an emphasis on the scholarship of teaching that is equal to that afforded research and service (Diamond, 1993). In anticipation of concrete modifications in the evaluation and reward procedures, faculty should be actively recording their excellent teaching, including the incorporation of new teaching techniques such as UID. Teaching portfolios can be used to document the enhancements to teaching and can provide reviewers with concrete data about teaching effectiveness (Murray, 1995).

Conclusion

The Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior have been used successfully in a variety of settings and with a diversity of target groups, behaviors, and subjects. The qualitative method of research used in this study may enhance the understanding of faculty responses that a closed ended questionnaire cannot tap, while also providing the basis for the development of a standardized instrument for use with a larger research sample. Future research is needed to gather information about faculty members' intentions to provide UID.

The specific purpose of this study was to apply the Theory of Planned Behavior to better understand faculty attitudes and behaviors towards providing Universal Instructional Design to students in their classes. Faculty responses to interview questions reveal common objections to universally designed curricula and provide suggestions for methods of intervention to influence faculty behavior. For instance, if the reward system does not reflect the importance of universal course design,

faculty may be more prone to spend time in other activities that are valued and rewarded. Application of this social psychological theory in an educational setting will provide educators with information for advancing Universal Design principles within the instructional environment at their institutions. It is particularly important in developmental education programs, which are the first postsecondary point of contact for many college students, that faculty incorporate universally designed curricula to enhance the learning environment for all students.

References

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg: Springer.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ajzen, I., & Madden, T. J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intention, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22,* 453-474.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39* (7), 3-7.

Curriculum Transformation and Disability. Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-secondary Education. Project #P333A990015.

Diamond, R. M. (1993). Changing priorities and the faculty reward system. In R. M. Diamond & B. E. Adam (Eds.), *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* (pp. 5-12). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dinsmore v. Pugh and the Regents of the University of California at Berkeley. (1989) (Settled).

Edgerton, R. (1993). The re-examination of faculty priorities. *Change, 25* (4), 10-25.

Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. *The Review of Higher Education, 17* (1), 43-68.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Fox, J. A., Hatfield, J. P., & Collins, T. C. (2003). Developing the Curriculum Transformation and Disability (CTAD) workshop model. In Higbee, J. L. (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Instructional Design in higher education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Fox, J. A., & Higbee, J. L. (2002). Enhancing literacy through the application of Universal Instructional Design: The Curriculum Transformation and Disability (CTAD) Project. In D. B. Lundell, & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Exploring urban literacy and developmental education* (pp. 59-65). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Goodin, S. (1985). Academic adjustments for students with learning disabilities—Two perspectives, Part 1: Service providers. *Proceedings of The Association on Handicapped Student Service Programs in Post-Secondary Education Eighth Annual Conference,* 83-86.

Hardin, C. J. (1998). Who belongs in college: A second look. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *Developmental education: Preparing successful college students* (pp. 15-24). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.

Henderson, C. (1999). *College freshmen with disabilities.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Higbee, J. L. (Ed.). (2003). *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Instructional Design in higher education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Higbee, J. L., Ginter, E. J., & Taylor, W. D. (1991). Enhancing academic performance: Seven perceptual styles of learning. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 7*(2), 5-10.

Jarrow, J. E. (1997). *Higher education and the ADA: Issues and perspectives.* Columbus, OH: Disability Access Information & Support.

Kincaid, J. (1994, February). The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 as applied to colleges and universities: An overview. In J. Kincaid & J. Simon (Eds.), *Issues in higher education and disability law* (pp. 5-7). Columbus, OH: Association on Higher Education and Disability.

Kincaid, J., & Simon, J. (1994). *Issues in higher education and disability law.* Columbus, OH: Association on Higher Education and Disability.

Lucas, A. F. (1990). Motivating faculty to improve the quality of teaching. In A. F. Lucas (Ed.), *The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching* (pp. 5-16). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Malouff, J. M. (1996). Disability accommodations that lower course standards. *College Teaching, 44,* 2.

Murray, J. P. (1995). The power of portfolios. *College Teaching, 43* (3), 82.

Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U. S. C. § 794 as amended (1973).

Seldin, P. (Ed.). (1990). *How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Silver, P., Bourke, A., & Strehorn, K. C. (1998). Universal Instructional Design in higher education: An approach for inclusion. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 31*(1), 47-51.

Waksler, R. (1996). Teaching strategies for a barrier-free classroom. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching, 7*(2), 99-111.

Whyte, W. F. (1982). Interviewing in field research. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), *Field research: A source book and field manual.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Multicultural Legacies for the 21st Century: A Conversation with James A. Banks

Patrick L. Bruch, Jeanne L. Higbee, and Dana Britt Lundell
University of Minnesota, General College

This conversation, conducted in May 2002 with the renowned theorist of multicultural education, James A. Banks, discusses ways that multicultural education can inform the work of developmental educators. It addresses early developments, current theories, student roles, and practical classroom, programmatic, professional, and public policy transformations. This conversation complements "Multicultural Education and Developmental Education: A Conversation with James A. Banks" (Bruch, Higbee, & Lundell, unpublished manuscript).

James A. Banks is Russell F. Stark Professor and Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. He is a past President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and a past President of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). Professor Banks is a specialist in social studies education and in multicultural education, and has written many articles and books in these fields. His books include *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (1975); *Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies* (1990); *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* (1997); and *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum and Teaching* (2001). Professor Banks is the co-editor of the *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (Banks & Banks, 1995, 2001); and editor of the "Multicultural Education Series" of books published by Teachers College Press, Columbia University. He is a member of the Board of Children, Youth, and Families of the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences. He is also a member of the National Academy of Education. The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL) brought Professor Banks to the University of Minnesota as a visiting scholar in May, 2002, when this interview was conducted.

Patrick Bruch: You've had a long and illustrious career as a multicultural theorist, curriculum specialist, and program developer. What pleasing surprises have you found along the way, and what have been the most stubborn or challenging obstacles you've encountered to full realization of the United States' democratic promises in education?

James Banks: Let me first say that it's an honor to be here at the University of Minnesota General College and to have the next generation working on these ideas because I'm at the last decade or two of my career, so it's nice to see a new generation coming on board. After 30 plus years in this field, one of the greatest surprises has been the sheer sustainability and momentum of multicultural education. I've been able to stay at this work for over three decades, as have scholars such as Geneva Gay, Carlos Cortés, Carl Grant, and H. Prentice Baptiste. There is a group of us who were at the beginning of this movement. It's surprising that we've stayed the course because there was a time when people wondered how much support multicultural education would get from teachers, scholars, and the public. It was precarious in the beginning because we were bringing forth new perspectives and challenging the existing canon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In part, we've been sustained by hope. We have to combine critique of the system with hope for a better one, because we really can't keep going in this work if we just focus on problems. The multicultural education movement has also been sustained by an incredible ground swell of support from practitioners. You have to keep in mind that multicultural education was a movement that started on the ground where the rubber hits the road; it started, if you will, on the streets. It literally started on the streets because it was the civil rights movement that created it. It was not the highly prestigious schools that endorsed multicultural work initially. Instead, as one example, the first people to invite me to California were not at Berkeley, Stanford, or the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA), but at California State University, Los Angeles, and California State University, Northridge. These were the big trainers of teachers. When I published my first important book in multicultural education, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (Banks, 1975), it was difficult to find a publisher who believed there was a market for it. It was Steve Matthews, a young White guy at Allyn and Bacon, who took it on. At first, it wasn't used at Berkeley or Stanford; it was the people at the Cal State campuses and at other state colleges that trained large numbers of teachers who used it most. Over the years, I've told these teacher educators how important they were to my work, because it was they who provided the ground swell that has given multicultural education its momentum. Another pleasant surprise is the incredible support multicultural education now gets from Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, and other leading research universities. UCLA invited me to give a lecture there about five years ago, about 20 years after the people at Cal State had invited me. A pleasant surprise has been staying the course and that this field has continued to exist, grow, and to gain academic legitimacy.

In addition to practitioner support, multicultural education has benefited from the warm reception of publications in the field. Examples include the *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (Banks & Banks, 1995), which was published by Macmillan in 1995 and reissued in 2001 by Jossey-Bass. The new edition of the *Handbook* will be published by Jossey-Bass in 2004. The reception of *Diversity Within Unity* (Banks et al., 2001) has also been warm. It is now in its third printing. The pleasant surprises have been the sustainability of this field, the reception, particularly at teacher training colleges and universities, and now the legitimization by the research institutions. I'm now training doctoral students in multicultural education who are finding jobs at excellent research universities, such as UCLA, the State University of New York at Buffalo, and The Ohio State University.

The obstacles have been the attacks from the right, and they continue. Arthur Schlesinger (1992), whom I've never viewed as a right-winger by any means, is one of the more thoughtful critics. Nevertheless, responding to criticisms such as those in his book, *The Disuniting of America,* has consumed a lot of our energies. Every day I have to get up and decide how much energy I will devote to responding to critics like Dinesh D'Souza (1991). D'Souza is a critic who hasn't done his homework, whereas Schlesinger is a thoughtful critic. But how much time do you spend responding to critics rather than doing essential work? *The Disuniting of America* was a very popular book because Schlesinger echoed the views of many Americans. There's a strong commitment to assimilationism, to maintaining the status quo, and to flag waving in the United States. Nationalistic sentiments have escalated since September 11, 2001. I feel a need to occasionally respond to critics like D'Souza and Schlesinger because I support thoughtful and reflective patriotism and think that good multicultural education teaches it. Events like September 11th can evoke a kind of conservatism and nonreflective patriotism that's deep in American culture. The impulse to resist change and defend the status quo is deep in American society. It's an impediment to any progressive movement, not just to multicultural education, but also to the feminist movement, to the gay rights movement, and to any quests for civil rights. It creates an ideological resistance to progress and social justice that is intractable.

But the good news is that the progressives are out there, too. This is demonstrated by the tremendous success of the books published in the Teachers College Press series I edit on multicultural education. There are now 15 books in the series, among them are best-sellers such as Gary Howard's (1999) *We Can't Teach What We Don't Know*, which has sold over 20,000 copies, and Sonia Nieto's (1999) *The Light in Their Eyes: Creating Multicultural Learning Communities*, which sold over 11,000 copies. There is good news and bad news: society has both progressive trends and more traditional and conservative trends. These two forces coexist, and we have to understand that they are there and that we have to live with them. Of course if we

40 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

believe in democracy, what we have to understand is that these two forces have a right to exist, and that we who are advocating diversity have to understand that other voices are also legitimate.

Dana Lundell: Our next question deals with the perspectives of individuals from historically dominant and subordinate groups. One important strand of multicultural education has been a reassessment of the roles played by nonprivileged persons in the United States. More specifically, multiculturalism has brought to light transformative knowledge created by scholars from groups that have experienced first hand the distance between the rhetoric and the realities of "democracy." What do you think is important about attending to the central role played historically by persons outside of privilege? Given that, what do you think are salutary or dangerous aspects of recent developments in what is being called "Whiteness Studies"?

J.B.: Let me start with the importance of the roles played historically by people outside of privilege, because I think they have played a significant role in shaping the quest for human rights. My book, *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge, and Action* (Banks, 1996), focuses on the roles of people on the margins in constructing knowledge. Why do I think that's so important? One, I think people on the margins bring a unique cultural eye to the U.S. experience. By the way, I do also think that people who have not been disadvantaged, who are in the mainstream, also bring a special perspective. In 1972 Robert Merton wrote an influential essay called "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge" about perspectives in the construction of knowledge during a heated debate about whose perspective is more legitimate and valid. This incisive article has been highly influential in my work. Merton argues that we need the perspectives of both insiders and outsiders because each brings a unique perspective on reality and helps us to construct the totality. The perspectives of those in the margins are very important in part because they haven't been included in the mainstream curriculum of schools, colleges, and universities. Students learn mainstream perspectives in most educational institutions. We need to make extra efforts to acquaint them with the voices and experiences of marginalized individuals and groups.

There are other reasons that marginalized voices are important. Okihiro's (1994) *Margins and Mainstreams* points out that people in the margins have been the groups who have called upon America to be faithful to its own ideals when those ideals were most seriously challenged and violated. When the United States violated its own ideals, such as democracy and human rights, most extensively, it was people on the margins who called upon America to be American. In other words, women and people of color have called upon America to live up to its own ideals. Let me give some examples. Slavery was a total violation of the U.S. Constitution. Who called upon America to live up to its ideals? It was Black and White abolitionists, both marginalized groups, who called upon America to live up to its own ideals. The internment of Japanese Americans was a blatant violation of American democratic values. It was Japanese Americans and their supporters who called upon America to live up to its own ideals.

The multicultural education movement is very American because it is calling upon America to live up to its own ideals. Multicultural education, like these other movements, is trying to make America *American*. That's how I like to phrase it. When Schlesinger (1992) argues that multicultural education is dividing America, he is assuming that America is united. My response is that multicultural education is not about dividing a united nation. It's about uniting a very divided nation. Movements like the abolitionist movement and other movements from the margins call upon America to live up to its democratic ideals. People of color led the civil rights movement. African Americans started it, and other groups joined in. They called upon America to be American. Consequently, we need to listen to the voices in the margins because they help us keep our moral compass. Otherwise we stray, and it's people on the outside who can see that so clearly and who call upon us to actualize American values. Those are among the reasons that we need to listen to the voices on the outside.

The second part of your question is a whole different issue. When you asked about the "dangerous" aspects of the White Studies movement, you're assuming that it looks dangerous to me in some ways, and I know the reason for the question. Some people may see it as dangerous because it may privilege Whiteness. I've heard that concern, and I'm sensitive

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to it. But on the other hand, my response is that this work is very important. I think it's important because my students, who are primarily White, many from rural communities, come into my classes thinking they don't have race and that it's something others have. White Studies is important because it enables White students to realize that they have race, and that it isn't something that only other folks have.

Critical White Studies is important to help students better understand Whiteness. In a course that I'm teaching this quarter, we read some of the people doing important work in this field like Matthew F. Jacobson. I use his book *Whiteness of a Different Color* (1998) in this class. Jacobson gives a history of the concept of race as it relates to Whites. He helps my students understand that Whites weren't always one race. For example, Jacobson talks about how early in the U.S. Whites were considered one race, but then came the fracturing of Whiteness during the turn of the last century when many immigrants came from Southern and Eastern Europe. Whiteness became differentiated into different kinds of groups, such as the Alpine, the Mediterranean, and the Hebrew. This is quite amazing for my students to understand—that Whites weren't always one race. They're amazed to learn about events like the Leo Frank case. When a Jewish man was accused of killing a girl in a pencil factory, a lynch mob came and took him out of jail and hanged him. Leo Frank was considered a Jew and not a White man in 1915 Atlanta. Italians in the South sometimes had to go to Black schools, which I didn't know. The concept of race as a social construction that changes over time is very important for students to learn.

The other important work I use in my classes to help White teachers better understand their own racialization is Gary Howard's (1999) book *We Can't Teach What We Don't Know*. I understand the concern that Whiteness can be privileged. That could happen, but I think if White studies is done like Jacobson and Howard, it's very important, particularly for White students who make up most of the students in teacher education programs in the U.S., to understand themselves as racial beings. Both the voices of scholars on the margins and critical White Studies by White scholars are important. It's not either-or, but to borrow from Merton (1972), we need multiple perspectives to construct a complete view of our world and society.

Pedagogies and Policies

Jeanne Higbee: Building on these theoretical ideas, we would like to try and address concrete steps that can be taken to move toward a more multicultural approach to various activities, such as curricula, teacher training, advising, and student development. What might it look like for developmental educators (i.e., persons working in programs that often serve students from groups historically underrepresented in mainstream institutions and marked by their institutions as underprepared for the regular work of that institution) to implement the kind of multicultural perspective that we've been discussing?

J. B.: What can developmental educators do? I will take a conceptual approach to this response because I think the specifics depend so much on circumstances. Teachers must help students from disempowered communities to see possibility and hope. How can we do this? We can let them observe, for instance, successful Black lawyers. They can shadow Black lawyers for a day. Growing up in my community I never saw, except for a teacher, a Black professional. I think one of the major reasons students don't achieve is that they don't see possibilities. They don't see how those professionals could be them. It reminds me of an article that I republished in 1971 by Donald Smith (1971), who was a professor at Chicago Teacher's College, describing a speakers model project he implemented when he was an eighth grade teacher. He was teaching in a Black inner-city community and he had a series of speakers come and show the class who they might become. He had Gwendolyn Brooks (1991) come in; she was a community poet, and every community has a poet. And he brought in a lawyer. He describes the power of this project. He calls it a project to increase the self-esteem of these young people. I'm a member of a community group that includes Black professional men, and one of our projects is to do outreach to Black high school students and have them shadow us for a day. I think ways to create hope, ways to create possibility, would go a long way because for many of these students we have to overcome many institutional impediments in the community.

J. H.: Thinking about these things reminds me of something that surprised me, which is that one of the work-study opportunities at a number of higher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education institutions is working with the America Reads program. That's an excellent opportunity for students to do community service and serve as role models.

J. B.: I think the idea of going back, tutoring inner-city youth like themselves, would be very appealing to college students.

P. B.: I had a student who did something along these lines as a service-learning project last semester. It wasn't literacy tutoring, but working with inner-city kids on academic projects. This student's first experience on his first day at this place was the kids saying, "You're not a college student." They couldn't believe he was in college because he wasn't White. He got a lot out of the experience of trying to help the kids he was working with, and I think he was able to give a lot in terms of helping them set high goals for themselves.

J. B.: Yes, these are ways of creating hope. At the same time, we have to overcome what Fordham and Ogbu (1986) call not wanting to "act White." It's a controversial idea, I know, but I think it does have some truth. Many youth from inner-city communities think that reading books is not cool. In my community I was teased for reading books, and I was laughed at because that wasn't a male thing to do. That was probably more of a class than a race issue. Fordham and Ogbu make the point that many African American students don't want to appear bookish because they think that's acting White. By extension, my guess is that not a lot of Latino students want to act White either in terms of this conception. How do we then help students understand that, when you look at Black history, for example, some of their ancestors risked their lives to learn how to read? Slaves took chances. How do we help African American students understand that reading can be about that history? That achievement is also part of the Black heritage? A big problem with working with students from disenfranchised backgrounds is helping them overcome the norm where being hip is not to read books or not to learn academic knowledge, but to do other things. We have to become a counter-culture in a sense.

Changing the values of students is a major challenge. What are the big impediments, and how do we overcome them? There are ways we can think about empowering students to see a new vision and a new possibility, to see that they can become a doctor, or to see that they can become a businessperson by spending some time in small Black businesses. The biggest impediment is how do we change their hearts and minds, how do we change their perceptions, and how do we inculcate the dream?

D. L.: How would you characterize the role of students in transforming institutions and creating social change? How can instructors work with students, and especially developmental education students, to facilitate their fullest participation in educational programs?

J. B.: Students need to experience a sense of efficacy, empowerment, and engagement. Instructors need to understand the environment from which the students are coming because many of these students are coming from an environment where they've never been empowered. We need to create an environment for developmental students that gives them a sense of hope and possibility. We need to create an environment that convinces students that they can have ownership and in which they have voice. Patricia Hill Collins (1990) in *Black Feminist Thought* talks about coming to voice, and she gives some examples of how that happens. But how do you help students come to voice in the classroom? How can they bring in their concerns and worries, such as violence and other major issues in some of our urban communities? I've seen interviews where young people say, "Oh, he may not be alive by age 20." How can we shape our curriculum to somehow mirror the concerns of living on the margins and living in unsafe communities? How can we bring their issues and voices to the classroom? I think these are real challenges for all of us as teachers. Let me give you an example that Patricia Hill Collins gives in a videotape I use in my class. She was teaching an elementary school class that was studying the community. But these were inner-city Black children, and they were reading about community helpers, with "nice" police and firemen. She said the kids thought the book was unreal. They couldn't relate to it. She rewrites the unit in a way that enables the students to discuss the real community they were living in, to address their issues, problems, and joys. There are positive aspects to their communities. This is how we might begin to help students develop a voice, a sense of empowerment, and a sense of efficacy so that they feel like education is the place where they can really get validated. I think that's the conceptual challenge.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Institutional Practices

J. H.: Recent public policy discussions and court cases have challenged the need for affirmative action in admissions and hiring in higher education. What is your sense of the current state of affairs? How can selective higher education institutions ensure that their admissions policies yield a campus community that enables all students to benefit from a multicultural learning environment?

J. B.: Let me respond conceptually to that question first because I think it's an important one. Bowen and Bok (1998) argue that a quality education must take place in a diverse classroom. You can't have quality if you only learn one perspective. They note that a quality education in the 21st century is an education that is diverse. Education needs to take place in an environment that includes people from different socioeconomic classes, races, and genders. I think that's also important. Clearly universities will have to go against the grain.

A real concern for me is our current Supreme Court and what's happening there. We're seeing the same thing with school desegregation with the courts not really supporting it. Despite all these legal constraints, we must remain committed to the dream, to bringing this nation together, but I don't know how we do it if we educate people in separate settings. We know where segregation leads us. It leads to balkanization and fragmentation. Orfield and Miller (1998) describe how we've given up the dream for school desegregation, and yet research shows that people who go to desegregated schools are more likely to live in desegregated neighborhoods. Blacks who go to desegregated schools are more likely to advance more effectively in their careers (Orfield & Kurlaender, 2001). Despite obstacles, I think universities have to work hard by raising money through endowments to supplement tuition for marginalized students because the tuition at state institutions is rising as states continue to decrease their level of funding. This is posing a difficult challenge. We're going to have to rely more on private funds.

I think that we have to stay committed to the ideals of this nation, and I think we need to construct unity because I don't think we're united as a nation. We are deeply divided along racial and class lines. I don't know how we can unite the nation without bringing people together in educational institutions.

Conclusion

P. B.: What, in your mind, have been the most constructive criticisms of either your own work in particular or of multiculturalism in general, and how have they contributed to the development of this work?

J. B.: The most constructive criticisms have been aimed at practices and not so much at the theory. For example, as Geneva Gay (2000) has pointed out, there is a wide gap between what we write about and what actually happens in schools. The wide gap between theory development and practice is our most challenging problem. We have been trying to close this gap through teacher training and staff development. This is perhaps true in developmental education as well. The gap between theory and practice is a difficult issue, particularly when the unfriendly critics call the bad practices multicultural education. Those have been the most challenging criticisms, and even they have been constructive in a way. A few conservative scholars have criticized my work. However, the major criticisms have been of poor practices that people have interpreted as multicultural education, as opposed to what we've tried to conceptualize. Of course, it's important for people to criticize. We live in a democracy. For years I read my critics, but I don't think they've paid me the same courtesy. It's been primarily a one-way situation. Recently I have devoted less attention to the critics because I find that it distracts me from my work. The critics of multicultural education are taking our work more seriously now.

My election to the presidency of the American Educational Research Association in 1996 and into the National Academy of Education in 2000 were landmark events for multicultural education. Another important marker of legitimization of the field is the upcoming conference that I will organize and chair, to be held at the Rockefeller Foundation's Study and Conference Center in Bellagio, Italy, in Summer 2002. It is called "Ethnic Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nation-States" and was funded by the Rockefeller and Spencer foundations. The book based on this conference will be published later this year by Jossey-Bass (Banks, in press). These are all signs of legitimacy, although the field is still in the process of gaining legitimacy. Remember I said that the multicultural movement was born on the streets. It is an extension of civil rights work and the civil rights

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

movement. We literally started on the streets, and from there we moved to state colleges and then to research universities. Attaining legitimacy is a process that any new field or discipline must experience. Multicultural education is making significant steps in this process. We haven't gotten there yet, but hopefully the next generation will take us into full legitimacy and institutionalization. The status of the profession reflects the people who make it up. We are minorities, women, and other groups on the margins. We've had to really work hard to earn respect and legitimacy. We've come a long way, and we must stay the course and keep our eyes on the prize. We shall overcome.

References

Banks, J. A. (1975). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (1st ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1990). *Teaching strategies for the social studies: Inquiry, valuing, and decision-making* (4th ed.). [With contributions by Ambrose A. Clegg, Jr.]. New York: Longman.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1996). *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (in press). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brooks, G. (1991). *Blacks.* Chicago, IL: Third World Press.

Bruch, P. L., Higbee, J. L., & Lundell, D. B. (unpublished manuscript). *Multicultural education and developmental education: A conversation with Dr. James A. Banks.* Minneapolis, MN: The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* Boston: Unwin, Hyman.

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus.* New York: Free Press.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting White." *The Urban Review, 18* (3), 176-206.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Howard, G. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacobson, M. F. (1998). *Whiteness of a different color: European immigrants and the alchemy of race* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology 78* (1), 9-47.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Okihiro, G. (1994). *Margins and mainstreams: Asians in American history and culture.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Orfield G., & Miller, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Chilling admissions: The affirmative action crisis and the search for alternatives.* Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Orfield G., & Kurlaender, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Schlesinger, A. M. (1992). *The disuniting of America.* New York: Norton.

Smith, D. H. (1971). A speaker models project to enhance pupils' self-esteem. In W. W. Joyce & J. A. Banks (Eds.), *Teaching the language arts to culturally different children* (pp. 276-280). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Is There a Role for Academic Achievement Tests in Multicultural Developmental Education?

Thomas Brothen and Cathrine Wambach
General College, University of Minnesota

As developmental educators strive to develop a multicultural curriculum, they should reflect on how their students became developmental students. The combination of high school grade performance and scores on standardized academic achievement tests such as the SAT predicts failure in college for some students. Those who pursue higher education in spite of this negative prediction are typically defined as developmental students. There has long been dissatisfaction over these predictors, especially standardized test scores and particularly how they affect students of color. In this chapter we review research on the usefulness of standardized academic achievement tests for developmental educators that counters the recent anti-testing position taken by Moore, Jensen, Hsu, and Hatch (2002).

The question of who should be admitted to the nation's four-year colleges and universities is regaining the public's attention with the recent decision of the Supreme Court striking down the University of Michigan's point system for increasing diversity on its campus (Berkowitz & Ladika, 2003). Prestigious colleges such as Michigan have made commitments to admitting qualified students of color in proportions equal to minority groups' representation in their states' populations. The success of students of color admitted to these schools is not an issue but the selection methods are because these schools use techniques other than high school grades and test scores to make admissions decisions. The plaintiffs in the Michigan case would like to see grades and test scores as the only criteria for admission, but the counter-argument is that these measures often underestimate the talent of students who must overcome adversity and discrimination to achieve academic success. Although the Michigan case deals with students at the highest levels of college qualifications, there are important implications for developmental education in this controversy. Specifically, do standardized tests serve any useful purpose for developmental educators and their students?

Moore, Jensen, Hsu, and Hatch (2002) argue that college entrance exams, especially the SAT, are biased against students of color. They imply that students with low SAT scores are misidentified (i.e., are false negatives), that students of color should be allowed to enter four-year colleges regardless of their academic qualifications, and that students of color placed in remedial courses are unjustly served no matter what their standardized test scores are. We will counter those arguments in three ways. First, we will very briefly review the literature on the validity of achievement tests suggesting they are as useful for students of color as they are for White students. Second, we will argue that community colleges are a reasonable option for many students who have not scored well on entrance exams or have high school grades below the admissions threshold for the four-year colleges of their choice. Third, we propose that a challenging and supportive multicultural curriculum will do more to address educational access and success than eliminating standardized tests. In sum, we argue that standardized tests can play a useful role in creating educational opportunities for all students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evidence for the Validity and Usefulness of Achievement Tests

Some educators are categorically opposed to the use of standardized tests. This position is exemplified by Moore et al. (2002) and the anti-test sources they cite. Their central argument is that the SAT and, by implication, other such standardized academic achievement tests, are invalid, biased, and hinder the progress of students who score low—particularly when they are students of color. However, this position fails to take into account the complex literature on standardized testing in general and the SAT in particular. For example, Jensen (1998) reported that there are on the order of 11,000 studies on the relationship between educational success and standardized test scores and that they consistently show that this relationship is positive. In his analysis of the records of a national cohort of students followed from 10th grade to age 30, Adelman (1999) found that a 12th grade SAT-like test predicted college matriculation and baccalaureate degree achievement extremely well and was actually better than any other predictor, even income level, at the lower ranges of student performance levels. This research suggests that the SAT accurately reflects how much students have learned in high school regardless of their grades or class standing.

Using the SAT to Identify Talent

Moore et al. (2002) also argued that the SAT is inconsistent with the developmental education principles of giving students access to higher education and the chance to develop their talents to their fullest. However, the history of the test suggests that its purpose is very consistent with what developmental educators strive to do in their work. Ackerman (1995) describes how the impetus for changing the SAT in the 1940s from essay tests to the standardized, objective approach used today was twofold. First, many educators were concerned that the subjective judgments of teachers affected high school grades and might not reflect the true abilities of some students, particularly those from ethnic minority groups. They believed that objectively scored tests would protect students from discrimination. They also believed that traditional IQ tests had limited ability to predict educational success and were confident that new instruments springing from advancements in testing theory and research would be much better predictors.

The refinement of the psychometric properties of aptitude tests and reconceptualizations of abilities in the mid 20th century moved much of the research and thinking about human abilities away from single property IQ conceptualizations to Thurstone's specific abilities approach that recognized and measured specific talents (Ackerman, 1995). Ackerman asserted that the Army General Classification Test (AGCT) was the embodiment of this approach as its' components predicted success in a variety of different training areas. Most researchers in this field today believe intelligence consists of more than just one overarching ability (e.g., Gardner, 1999; Sternberg, 1985). In fact, Jensen (1998), one of the foremost researchers of the past three decades in this area, argues that the concept of "intelligence" has lost most of its meaning and that we should discard it and replace it with a focus on specific abilities. The SAT and ACT have moved further in this direction over the years as they adapt to reflect what is taught in the standard high school curriculum (e.g., Powers & Rock, 1999).

Second, Ackerman (1995) detailed how the successful experience with the AGCT during World War II as a valid predictor of achievement in army training schools revealed that the academic potential of large numbers of Americans was not being utilized. Many high scoring individuals had neither attended college nor aspired to it. The President's Commission assigned to examine the issue of how to identify talent for an increasingly technological society that demanded college educated individuals concluded that many otherwise talented people were being denied opportunities for higher education and that standardized tests would help identify them. A familiar, diametrically opposed interpretation echoed by Moore et al. (2002), characterizes the SAT as undemocratic. However, Ackerman describes the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) approach quite differently. Many educators in the 1940s believed that the old essay exams used to assess college potential were biased because they favored students who had attended elite prep schools. The opponents of ETS's approach were educational conservatives holding on to the traditional liberal arts curriculum for traditional students. Objective, standardized tests were designed to democratize higher education. We assert that it is useful to view them similarly today: as a means to help students be successful.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A related criticism echoed in Moore et al. (2002) is that SAT preparation courses with expensive price tags give unfair advantage to students whose parents can afford them. This argument implies that the same income advantage that allows students from higher socioeconomic classes to pay for and attend elite prep schools invalidates the SAT's capacity to accurately identify talent. Here too, the research on this issue presents a different picture. More than two decades ago Jensen (1980) reviewed the research on SAT preparation programs and concluded that their effect on test scores was marginal at best. Since then Kulik, Bangert-Drowns and Kulik (1984) performed a meta-analysis on SAT coaching effectiveness studies and found an effect size of +.15 standard deviations, a significant but small advantage to taking these courses. Messick and Jungblut (1981) reviewed coaching programs and found that this effect is primarily a function of coaching time. They concluded that SAT scores increase as the coaching regimen approaches actual instruction time. That is, as the coaching programs become more like the curriculum, they improve SAT scores more. It seems clear from this that good schooling and more of it does improve SAT scores. This has several important implications, as we will discuss below. In any case, the fairness issue may be effectively moot as recent research (Powers & Rock, 1999) continues to show the coaching effect is small while ETS provides preparation materials free to anyone (College Board, 2003) and many high schools have SAT preparation books in their libraries and provide SAT coaching courses for a nominal fee.

The history of the SAT is one of identifying talent to provide broader educational opportunities. Tests such as the ACT and SAT are used more today to measure students' educational preparation. The basic principle remains however—to help institutions, educators, and students decide on appropriate educational venues and interventions.

The SAT and Ethnic Minorities

As Moore et al. (2002) point out, standardized aptitude tests have been used in the past to make false claims about the abilities of various ethnic groups. The waves of immigrants in the early 20th century were the targets of misguided attempts to classify non-Northern Europeans as mentally defective. People of color are rightly concerned by allegations that periodically arise of racial inferiority on the basis of test scores. There are plenty of reasons to question the validity of IQ test score differences between ethnic groups. However, most psychologists would accept the assertion that ability tests can provide useful information about individuals, especially when we have appropriate norm groups available. On the other hand, psychologists have also long recognized that taking a standardized test such as the SAT is a stressful experience (Sternberg, 1985). For example, Steele (1997) has demonstrated that "stereotype threat" makes minority students taking standardized tests feel the weight of representing their ethnic groups. Steele's research demonstrates that test situations are threatening and thus depress minority group members' scores.

The reality and implications of group differences on standardized tests is complex, and it is not our goal in this chapter to review reasons for main effect group differences on them. The reader can consult a comprehensive overview of research on group differences and what they mean in Neisser et al. (1996). The important question about standardized academic aptitude and achievement tests is whether or not they accurately predict college performance for all students who take them.

In his review of the potential sources of bias in standardized testing, Jensen (1980) pointed out that the SAT overpredicts college achievement for African American students. Lynn and Mau (2001) recently showed this effect for Asian and Hispanic students as well as for African Americans. This means that these groups' SAT scores predict higher college GPAs than they actually achieve. Instead of the SAT discriminating against minorities, this view of the data suggests it does the opposite. That is, the SAT gives minority students an advantage in admission decisions over a procedure that would accurately predict their college performance.

We argue that the SAT is identifying college potential as it was originally designed to do, but also that the real concern for educators should be that students of color are not performing as well as the test predicts they should in college. Our goal as developmental educators should be to find ways to bridge this gap. Two areas of research are informative in this regard.

First, Ackerman (1995) reports that during World War II many illiterate men were rejected for service on the basis of their low AGCT scores. Because many of

them were presumably African Americans who were functionally illiterate due to that era's grossly unequal educational opportunities, the army was "under pressure from the black community" (p. 293) to do something about the high rejection rate for these individuals. Ackerman reports the success of an intensive 12-week course that enabled 250,000 men to raise their standardized AGCT test scores and benefit from further army training. This illustrates the importance of effective educational interventions for those whose scores on a standardized test probably had more to do with the lack of prior education than their ability to ultimately profit from an adequate educational intervention.

Second, Fleming (2000), no advocate of standardized testing, reports provocative research results on the overprediction issue with African American students. Her data shows that the SAT overpredicts for African American students attending predominantly White colleges but predicts accurately for African American students attending predominantly Black colleges. Fleming's research again highlights the importance of felicitous educational environment. It supports the hypothesis that historically Black colleges provide an environment that makes it more likely for African American students to be successful.

Admission to Four-Year Versus Two-Year Colleges

Research on college students in general (Adelman, 1999) and minority students in particular (Miller, 1990) has consistently found that they are more likely to persist to a bachelor's degree if they begin their studies at four-year colleges. However, four-year colleges typically cannot serve everyone who applies. Research, including studies reviewed in this chapter, has also demonstrated that students with better high school grades and higher test scores are more likely to persist to graduation than students with lower grades and scores. When admission choices must be made, choosing the best-qualified students on the most accurate measures available makes sense. Admitting students with strong high school preparation allows college faculty to set high expectations for student performance, which preserves the quality of the curriculum (Grubb, 1999; McCabe, 2000). Although highly selective colleges can and do successfully provide intense academic support for small groups of underprepared students (Wambach & Brothen, 2002), admitting large numbers of them would change the character of these colleges. For students whose academic credentials are weak, beginning postsecondary education at a two-year school is often their only choice. Many students who begin at two-year colleges, persist there, and are committed to baccalaureate degree completion, successfully transfer to four-year colleges (Adelman).

Community colleges admit the broadest possible range of students, and do not require students to take the SAT and ACT before admission, so they use placement tests, which are a type of achievement test, to identify students' academic strengths and weaknesses and develop interventions to assist them (cf., McCabe, 2000). Although it is reasonable to argue what form these interventions should take and whether or not they should be mandatory, their use acknowledges the fact that students are different from each other in their preparation to do college level work. Both research on the validity of achievement tests and experience in the classroom tell us that a student who scores in the 10th percentile and one who scores in the 90th percentile on a reading test are likely to have different experiences when reading college textbooks. Tests such as the SAT, ACT, COMPASS and Accuplacer provide important pieces of the information students need to make realistic academic plans, and faculty need to help students learn. Using such tests has become standard for all students matriculating at college. The real question is not whether the tests should be used, but how they should be used.

We have long had questions about the practice of using standardized tests to place developmental students in skills courses (Wambach & Brothen, 1990; 2000). Much research suggests that when students are required to take remedial courses in more than one skill area, their chances of persistence decrease (c.f., Boylan & Saxon, 1999). Others, however (e.g., Behrman, 2000; McCabe, 2000), assert that when students who are placed in remedial courses complete them, their chances for success in future courses equal those of other students. They also argue that skill remediation is worthwhile even for students who do not persist. This is a complex argument over the way tests are used, the kinds of interventions available to students, and the educational values reflected in these practices. We have argued against using achievement tests as the sole basis

for mandatory placement into remedial courses for two basic reasons. We think that tests can only be used for placement in remedial courses when accompanied by other relevant information about students' preparation. We also think that stand alone pre college-level courses in reading and writing may not be the best way to develop these skills. However, we believe the use and development of valid and reliable assessment procedures should continue. At the very least, current tests can provide information to advisors and students about appropriate course selection and to teachers about what their students' needs are. They can also be highly useful as measures to evaluate program effectiveness.

A Challenging and Supportive Multicultural Curriculum

Our own theory of developmental education (Wambach, Brothen, & Dikel, 2000) suggests that students coming to college need to feel they are being challenged intellectually. If they do not, they are likely to become discouraged and drop out. This means they should receive challenging course material and we have described an approach to providing that (Brothen & Wambach, 2000). Our approach is consistent with Adelman's (1999) findings on challenging curricula. Although he found that standardized test scores predicted college access and achievement well, he found that quality of high school preparation predicted even better. This has important implications for improving the educational success of students of color. For example, he showed that if African American students had access to the top 40% of high schools, their baccalaureate degree achievement would increase by over 27%. Clearly, improving both college and high school curricula is where our attention should be devoted.

Because curricular improvement interacts with students' particular histories, all developmental students as well as students of color will need support to meet academic challenges in college. First, students need to believe that the "remediation" in skills courses is significant and important to their future. Thus, a reading course, for example, must seem important to students' goals. Second, students need to think the entire curriculum is relevant to them and to their futures.

Developmental educators must find effective ways for students to acquire in as short a time as possible the important and relevant skills they need to be successful. Standardized aptitude, achievement, and placement tests including the SAT are useful in helping students understand what skills they need to improve to be successful in college (c.f., Behrman, 2000). These tests can also be particularly useful for institutions as evaluation measures to determine whether their interventions are effective.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to define multicultural developmental education. The reader should consult the multicultural education research base, which is large and getting larger all the time. For example, Banks et al. (2001) provide teachers with the latest research, theory, and practical advice for creating a multicultural curriculum. These authors also state a basic principle that many developmental educators might agree with about tracking students on the basis of prior performance and measured ability, that it "has a negative effect on the achievement of many students in the lower tracks, and does not particularly benefit those in higher tracks" (p. 7). Because the overwhelming bulk of research in this area is based on primary and secondary school students, the relevance of this statement to developmental education is questionable. The concept of "tracking" has a very different meaning and history in higher education. Much of developmental education is a form of tracking on the basis of test scores and prior performance. Fortunately, the application of multicultural education research and practice to developmental education at the postsecondary level is only in its beginning stages (cf. Bruch & Higbee, 2002) and we have many choices to make to create the best environment for all of our students. Discovering what our students need and designing curricula to provide it can be facilitated by the objective data provided by standardized tests.

Evidence is growing that a multicultural curriculum is important for all students and may be crucial to students of color. If we can extrapolate from Fleming's (2000) results that suggest a better fit for African American students at historically Black colleges, students of color need to recognize in the curriculum something about themselves and their concerns. As we build a multicultural developmental curriculum, we need to be aware of the limits of testing but not dismissive of the information that tests provide us about our students and how we can help them achieve their goals.

References

Ackerman, M. (1995). Mental testing and the expansion of educational opportunity. *History of Education Quarterly, 35*, 279-300.

Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment.* Retrieved February 10, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Toolbox/Title.html

Banks, J. et al. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Retrieved February 10, 2003, from University of Washington, Seattle, Center for Multicultural Education: http://www.educ.washington.edu/coewebsite/pdf/MAKINGaDIFFERENCE.pdf

Behrman, E. H. (2000). Developmental placement decisions: Content-specific reading assessment. *Journal of Developmental Education, 23* (3), 12-18.

Berkowitz, J., & Ladika, T. (2003, June 24). Split decision. *The Michigan Daily.* Retrieved June 27, 2003 from http://www.michigandaily.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2003/06/24/3ef84fd007bcc

Boylan, H. R., & Saxon, D. P. (1999). *Outcomes of remediation.* Retrieved June 26, 2002 from Appalachian State University, National Center for Developmental Education: http://www.ced.appstate.edu/centers/ncde/

Brothen, T., & Wambach, C. (2000). A research based approach to developing a computer-assisted course for developmental students. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *The many faces of developmental education* (pp. 59-72). Warrensburg, MO: National Association for Developmental Education.

Bruch, P., & Higbee, J. L. (2002). Reflections on multiculturalism in developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 33*, 77-90.

College Board Cm. (2003). *SAT Prep Center.* Retrieved February 10, 2003, from http://apps.collegeboard.com/satprep/index.jsp

Fleming, J. (2000). Affirmative action and standardized test scores. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 27-37.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York: Basic Books.

Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in the community colleges.* New York: Routledge.

Jensen, A. R. (1980). *Bias in mental testing.* New York: Free Press.

Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor: The science of mental ability.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kulik, J. A., Bangert-Drowns, R. L., & Kulik, C-L. C. (1984). Effectiveness of coaching for aptitude tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 179-188.

Lynn, R., & Mau, W-C. (2001). Ethnic and sex differences in the predictive validity of the scholastic achievement test for college grades. *Psychological Reports, 88*, 1099-1104.

Messick, S., & Jungblut, A. (1981). Time and method in coaching for the SAT. *Psychological Bulletin, 89*, 191-216.

McCabe, R. H. (2000). *No one to waste: A report to public decision makers and community college leaders.* Washington, D C: Community College Press.

Miller, C. A. (1990). Minority student achievement: A comprehensive perspective. *Journal of Developmental Education, 13* (3), 6-8, 10-11.

Moore, R., Jensen, M., Hsu, L., & Hatch, J. (2002). Saving the "false negatives": Intelligence tests, the SAT, and developmental education. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Exploring urban literacy and developmental education* (pp. 47-57). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T. J., Boykin, A. W., Brody, N. Ceci, S. J., et al. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. *American Psychologist, 51*, 77-101.

Powers, D. E., & Rock, D. A. (1999). Effects of coaching on SAT I: Reasoning test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 36*, 93-118.

Steele, C. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*, 613-629.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wambach, C., & Brothen, T. (1990). An alternative to the prediction-placement model. *Journal of Developmental Education, 20* (3), 14-15, 24-26.

Wambach, C., & Brothen, T. (2000). Content area reading tests are not a solution to reading test validity problems. *Journal of Developmental Education, 24* (2), 42-43.

Wambach, C., & Brothen, T. (2002). *Developmental education in the Big 10*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Wambach, C., Brothen, T., & Dikel, T. N. (2000). Toward a developmental theory for developmental educators. *Journal of Developmental Education, 24* (1), 2-4, 6, 8, 10, 29.

The Triumphs and Tribulations of a Multicultural Concerns Committee

David L. Ghere
General College, University of Minnesota

The Multicultural Concerns Committee in the General College at the University of Minnesota has 15 years of experience fostering an awareness of multicultural issues and transforming curriculum to reflect the diversity of our society. The committee has sponsored a wide variety of public programs, created an ample supply of multicultural resources, and initiated several significant research projects. In the process, the committee has gradually overcome individual opposition and institutional inertia in the effort to promote a more inclusive learning and working environment.

The Multicultural Concerns Committee (MCC) promotes a more inclusive learning and working environment by fostering an awareness of multicultural issues and concerns among faculty, staff, and students at the General College (GC) and in the wider University of Minnesota community. Committee members involve themselves in faculty governance, curriculum review, and program evaluation, as well as the recruitment and hiring process to ensure that multicultural concerns and perspectives are incorporated into these discussions and deliberations. The MCC has sponsored a variety of seminars, workshops, presentations, and discussions designed to inform, guide, and inspire students, faculty, and staff. The MCC has supported curriculum projects resulting in the development of new courses and the revision of old courses to incorporate multicultural concepts and a diversity of perceptions into college courses. Some MCC programs have provided the basis for larger projects that have been disseminated by presentations at national conferences and by publications of various types.

Administrators, faculty, and staff who are seeking to promote a more inclusive environment at their college or university may benefit from the experience of the MCC at General College. As with any organization, the MCC has gone through various stages in its 15 years in existence. The fervent efforts of the committee's founders resulted in a flurry of activity designed to educate and inspire the faculty and staff, transform the curriculum, and establish the committee's role in the college. Based upon the successes and frustrations of these early years, the committee shifted its program focus to enlightening students while continuing to advance the systematic transformation of the college through incremental changes. In recent years, the committee has augmented its college and university activities by addressing national audiences through conference presentations and publications.

General College, established in 1932, was originally designed as an opportunity for nontraditional students and underserved high school students to attend the University of Minnesota. The General College had no specific research mission and offered a general education curriculum, adjusted periodically to the perceived needs of the student population, leading to a variety of associate and baccalaureate degrees. The college had the most diverse student body on the university campus, and many faculty and staff attempted to provide a supportive educational environment for students of color. Even though the educational concept of multiculturalism had not yet

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

emerged, some faculty incorporated content or perspectives into the teaching of their courses that reflected the diversity among their students. The emergence of community colleges in the 1960s and 1970s provided other postsecondary options for nontraditional students and initiated a period of uncertainty for the college. Many critics contended that the General College was no longer necessary to the mission of the university (Taylor, 2002).

The college experienced fundamental changes in its mission and in the work of its faculty and staff in the late 1980s. The university decided to terminate the college's associate and baccalaureate degree programs, which were seen as redundant; students seeking associate degrees could pursue this goal at local community colleges, while baccalaureate degrees are offered through other colleges of the University of Minnesota. Concurrently, General College was reconceptualized as a developmental education program for "at-risk" students, leading to transfer into one of the degree-granting colleges in the university. The college's new teaching mission was to incorporate active learning teaching methods and academic skills development into freshman-level content courses that would enable students to achieve academic success in the wider university. The college was also given a research mission, utilizing its students and classrooms, to become a national leader in the research, theory, and practice of developmental education. The work scopes of existing faculty and staff were renegotiated and the expectations for new faculty and staff revised, resulting in a dramatic metamorphosis of the college to conform to these new missions. It was in this context that the Multicultural Concerns Committee emerged (Taylor, 2002, 2003).

Early Years: 1987-1992

The interest in establishing a multicultural concerns committee developed during the 1987-1988 school year within a small group of staff and faculty committed to developing a more inclusive collegiate environment. A number of advisers recognized that the student body consisted of increasing numbers of students of color who were having difficulty adjusting to the university community. Members of the instructional staff recognized that the curriculum displayed limited cultural diversity, both in terms of specific focused courses and the content within typical freshman courses. Staff of color were particularly aware of these two issues, and many felt marginalized professionally. These various individuals began meeting informally to share their concerns, analyze problems, consider solutions, and generate plans of action (Multicultural Concerns Committee, 1991).

This group saw multiculturalism as central to the college's new teaching and research missions in developmental education and advocated the merging of developmental and multicultural concepts into a coherent program. They believed that multiculturalism could provide the philosophical basis that would enable the college to succeed in its developmental education mission. The transition period to the college's new mission provided the most opportune time to accomplish the goal of integrating multiculturalism throughout the college. These advocates wanted the Multicultural Concerns Committee to be a fully recognized standing committee of the college with the mission of ensuring that the guiding documents, governance system, and academic policies of the college, as well as the formation of the curriculum and teaching of classes, were adequately infused with multicultural concepts and perspectives (Gardner, 2003).

Opposition to the formation of the Multicultural Concerns Committee stemmed from a variety of perspectives. Some saw little relevance of multiculturalism to their teaching content or considered the issues unimportant in general. Some feared that the committee would take extreme positions and become a divisive force in the college. Others thought that the General College already dealt successfully with the most diverse student body on campus and had a long history of addressing issues of multiculturalism in the curriculum and classroom. Some perceived the committee as a place where members would engage in self-congratulatory talk about their liberalism while others were busy doing the work of providing multiple perspectives to their class content (Amram, 2003; Gardner, 2003; Kroll, 2003; Taylor, 2003).

Dean David Taylor envisioned multicultural education as complimentary to the developmental mission of the college and vital to the future role of the college within the university. He designated the MCC as a dean's ad hoc committee in 1989, and challenged it to consider the appropriate organization, functions, and responsibilities for the committee, as well as to assess the current interest in and practice of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

multicultural education in the college. Committee members wrote a GC Survey on Multicultural Education which was distributed in April, 1990. This survey elicited responses concerning the definition, objectives, pedagogy, and socio-political purposes of multicultural education, as well as current examples of multicultural practices at GC and the possible dilemmas posed by a college commitment to multicultural education. The survey was analyzed during the summer, and a report was disseminated to the GC faculty and staff in September, 1990.

A flurry of MCC activities were initiated to meet the needs of the GC community that the committee had identified. In July, 1990, several committee members facilitated a week-long GC Multicultural Education Seminar, and the 18 participants completed projects integrating multicultural concepts and perspectives into their courses. Distinguished scholars in multicultural education were brought in to make university-wide keynote presentations as well as to conduct workshops with the faculty and staff. The series included Ronald Takaki (1993), author of *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, in Fall, 1990, and Deborah Rosenfelt, Director of the Curriculum Transformation Project at the University of Maryland, in Winter, 1991. James Banks (1996; Banks & Banks, 2001), Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, was a visiting professor for the entire Spring quarter in 1991 and presented a week-long seminar for faculty and staff. There were a number of other smaller workshops and presentations by scholars or university personnel (Multicultural Concerns Committee, 1991).

This period also saw the production of some very impressive multicultural education source books and bibliographies. A research assistant was hired by the dean's office to compile multicultural resources, which resulted in two General College publications. A 270-page compilation of multicultural articles titled *Towards a Multicultural Curriculum* was produced in October, 1989, and a 268-page curriculum guide for multicultural education titled *Developing an Inclusive Curriculum* was published on November 12, 1990 (Lewis, 1989, 1990). The GC Multicultural Education Seminar also prompted the production of a 600-page compilation of multicultural materials in July, 1990, titled *Multicultural Education Seminar for General College Teaching Faculty & Student Services Personnel* (Albrecht & Peralez, 1990). In September, 1991, a 66-page study titled *The Effect of Ethnic Background on General College Student's Views of the Campus Climate* was produced based on a survey completed by GC freshmen in the spring of 1991 (Schmitz & Hickey, 1991). These works provided both the committee and the college with an abundance of multicultural materials that were utilized during the following decade.

The MCC prepared a final report and recommendations in May of 1991 after two years as a dean's committee. This summarized the committee's activities, provided recommendations for implementing multicultural education at the college, and proposed the composition and functions of the committee. The report also provided the definition below, which had been adopted after the committee had researched the academic literature and solicited ideas from the GC community.

> Multicultural education is a process of teaching and learning that promotes an awareness of and knowledge about cultural differences and the recognition and validation of human achievement. It is a conceptual framework that seeks to promote an understanding and appreciation of the contributions that racial, religious, socio-cultural groups, and women have made to the total culture in a variety of ways. As a result, it will likely challenge a long history of ethnocentrism and will identify how we relate to and accept diversity and how we define social justice. (Multicultural Concerns Committee, 1991, p. 2)

The report also recommended that the MCC become a subcommittee of the college's Policy and Planning Committee. MCC advocates would have preferred the status of a standing committee, which would have recognized the centrality of multiculturalism to the college's mission and enhanced the authority and scope of the committee. The exercise of that power would have required an elected membership representative of the college community, but the committee had been spawned by the interest, motivation, and commitment of individuals. MCC members were torn by this dilemma between an elected standing committee and a volunteer activist committee while opponents sought to limit the committee's stature and power. The recommendation in the report was thus a compromise position resulting in the MCC becoming

a subcommittee of the Policy and Planning Committee in Fall of 1992 (Gardner, 2003).

Middle Period: 1993-1998

The Minnesota Legislature in 1994 decided that the University of Minnesota, and thus the General College, should convert from a quarter system to a semester system. A four-year transition process was established for the revision of courses, the creation or elimination of other courses, the revamping of graduation requirements, and the determination of the graduation requirements satisfied by each course in preparation for the initiation of a semester system in Fall, 1999. The MCC monitored this process to ensure that multicultural issues and perspectives were not lost during this transformation of the curriculum. The MCC also recognized this transition period as an opportunity for faculty to incorporate more multicultural issues and perspectives into their courses. The committee provided various programs and materials to assist faculty in accomplishing that goal (Ghere, 2003; Kroll, 2003, Stewart, 1998).

The transition to semesters created disagreement within supporters of multiculturalism. Some writing instructors wanted to have all sections of the required composition course focus on multicultural issues and be recognized as satisfying the student graduation requirement for one cultural diversity course. This would ensure that every student in General College would be introduced to multicultural education. However, other members of the MCC were concerned about the quality and consistency of this multicultural education considering that most writing courses were being taught by graduate students whose longevity was limited. Moreover, the committee had fostered the development of an array of multicultural courses providing a variety of cultural diversity experiences that would be threatened if every student had already satisfied the graduation requirement for cultural diversity with the required writing course. After some acrimony, the MCC recommended that although all writing courses should contain multicultural materials and perspectives, only those sections that were designed around multicultural themes and focused on the analysis of diversity issues should satisfy the cultural diversity requirement. The writing faculty and college ultimately accepted this recommendation (Gardner, 2003; Ghere, 2003).

The program emphasis of MCC shifted in the middle 1990s to focus more on student issues, with presentations and discussions directed towards a student audience. In the 1993-1994 school year, a series of programs focusing on the college environment and classroom climate were provided. The following year, college forums focused on the issue of stereotypes and their effects on relationships between students. In 1995-1996 a project titled "Multicultural Conversations" facilitated a series of small student group conversations concerning multicultural relations in the General College. These conversations were videotaped for use as discussion prompts at college forums. Many programs provided in 1997 and 1998 were focused on curricular issues related to semester conversion, but there were also forums for students addressing multicultural communication styles and dialogues about race. Also in 1998, members of an MCC subcommittee produced a video project based on their personal experiences, titled "Women's Voices on Race, Class and Gender," which was presented to a university audience (Stewart, 1998).

One issue that spanned the mid 1990s was the MCC's continued efforts to seek greater institutional recognition. Several proposals were initiated during these years that would have established the MCC as a regular standing committee in the college, but each proposal failed to secure enough votes for passage. The MCC was successful in placing a nonvoting delegate on the Policy and Planning committee to voice multicultural perspectives and raise diversity issues. However, repeated efforts to secure voting rights for that position were deemed contrary to the elected representative nature of that committee. The middle 1990s was a period of significant turnover in faculty and staff due to retirements and new hires. MCC members served on search committees to ensure that new faculty and staff were committed to multiculturalism and contributed to the diversity in the college. Some members identified prospects at conferences and actively recruited their application for positions in the college. By the end of the 1990s, General College's commitment to multiculturalism had increased significantly due to the strong support of new faculty and staff (Gardner, 2003; Stewart, 1998).

MCC continued to seek institutional change by supporting its members in election to the three standing committees that engaged in faculty governance. Those

representatives were able to ensure that appropriate language addressing multiculturalism was incorporated into college materials, curricular guidelines, search documents, and student, faculty, and staff handbooks. In the mid 1990s, the University of Minnesota initiated college mission statements and annual compacts clarifying both the college's commitment to various goals and the expectations of central administration for their completion. MCC ensured that these documents also incorporated appropriate language that emphasized multicultural issues and perspectives (Gardner, 2003; Ghere, 2003).

Growing support for multiculturalism at the General College led to a decision in 1998 to recruit a senior scholar in multicultural education who would bring the college instant national recognition and assist GC faculty and staff to publish and present in that field. Although the search attracted a number of impressive applicants, it ultimately failed to secure a scholar of the status desired. Most leaders in multicultural education reside in colleges of education training teachers or in ethnic studies departments preparing students for those majors. Despite GC's sincere interest in multicultural education, the college had neither the students nor the programs that would attract distinguished leaders in the field. The search was cancelled when it failed to produce an applicant pool of nationally recognized senior scholars (Ghere, 2003).

Recent Endeavors: 1999-2003

The struggle for formal recognition of the centrality of multiculturalism to the General College culminated in the 1998-1999 school year. First of all, with the financial support of the dean, MCC established the General College Multicultural Recognition Award, which was first awarded in the spring of 1999. This award recognizes the contributions of GC staff to multiculturalism and social justice and is announced at the annual General College Awards Banquet. Secondly, General College funded MCC members to attend national conferences where they addressed the role of the MCC at the General College and the manner in which multiculturalism had been integrated into the General College curriculum. These first steps at national dissemination of MCC activities have spawned a new aspect in the role of the MCC (Ghere, 2003; Taylor, 2003).

After more than 10 years of a wide variety of programs, the MCC determined that additional faculty and staff might become interested in multicultural issues if the discussion was directly applicable to General College. Therefore, MCC issued a call for the writing of case studies by instructors, advisors, and staff that conveyed actual experiences in General College that raised multicultural issues. Thirty case studies were eventually submitted, which a subcommittee of MCC edited. The subcommittee also developed pertinent discussion questions related to these cases. They were utilized by MCC in a college forum, and the interest generated resulted in their use as the major activity at the 2001 General College Fall retreat. Workshops utilizing these cases were conducted at four national conferences during 2002 and 2003, and a paper focusing on six cases was published in the *Symposium Proceedings of Keeping our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color* (Jehangir et al., 2002). These disseminations attracted the interest of publishers and, since February, 2003, several MCC members have been collaboratively writing an article, and a subcommittee has been organized to produce two books, one for use in the classroom and one for staff development (Ghere, 2003).

In 2001 the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington Banks et al. published a survey to assess the climate for multiculturalism in schools. MCC recognized a need for a similar tool in higher education and received permission to adapt the University of Washington survey for that purpose. With support from the GC dean's office, MCC initiated the Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT). In Fall, 2001, a subcommittee of MCC revised the original checklist, adapted it for an online format, and conducted a pilot survey of all GC employees and graduate assistants. The results were analyzed the following spring and presented at college forums in May and November, 2002. The concept and survey findings were disseminated at three developmental and higher education conferences in November 2002 and February 2003. The subcommittee has continued to revise and adjust the survey in preparation for its future publication while projecting the publication of several related articles and the development of a grant proposal for a multi-phase, multi-site research project mapping the national geography of perceptions of multiculturalism in higher education (Miksch et al., 2002).

Members of the MCC have been in the forefront of recent efforts to examine the congruent and complementary natures of multicultural education and developmental education. The similarities in theoretical and practical approaches to the two have been addressed in conference presentations and published articles. In November 2002 General College sponsored a conference titled "Future Directions in Developmental Education" which focused on the theme of "Diversity and Multiculturalism in Developmental Education" (Higbee & Pettman, 2003). The planning for a number of future articles and presentations on these topics was initiated at that meeting. The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy's monograph *Multiculturalism in Developmental Education* is in part a continuation of those MCC activities (Ghere, 2003).

The MCC has continued to promote the integration of multicultural perspectives into the General College curriculum and to increase the multicultural awareness of faculty, staff, and students. The significant turnover in faculty during the 1990s and the interest of many new faculty in multiculturalism prompted MCC to shift its program focus back to faculty development. In recent years, the MCC, with the financial support of the dean, has sponsored visits by distinguished scholars in multicultural education: Joseph L. White (White & Cones, 1999), author of *Black Man Emerging: Facing the Past and Seizing the Future in America* in 2001; James Banks (1996; Banks & Banks, 2001), Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, in 2002; and Christine Sleeter (1996, 2001), author of *Multicultural Education as Social Activism*, in 2003. Each of these visits included a keynote address to the wider University of Minnesota and regional audience, a workshop with GC faculty, and an interaction with GC students. Other multicultural programs have been presented in the form of guest speakers, open forums, and case studies. Multiculturalism has also been the focus of several General College retreats where all members of the college community participated in discussing these concerns, assessing current activities, and planning future endeavors (Ghere, 2003).

Conclusion

The Multicultural Concerns Committee has achieved significant changes within the General College and the University of Minnesota. MCC has not been as aggressive or officially powerful as some had hoped, nor as domineering and divisive as others had feared. Instead, through persistent pressure and deliberate decisions, MCC has been able to respectfully confront individual resistance and gradually overcome institutional inertia to effect significant changes in the General College. For 15 years, MCC has educated faculty, staff and students concerning multicultural issues, insured consideration of diversity in college decisions, and integrated multicultural perspectives and language into college documents and literature. Concurrently, MCC has facilitated the hiring of a more diverse college faculty and staff, has fostered the expansion of multicultural course offerings, and has promoted the inclusion of a wider variety of perspectives in other college courses. The committee has also matured as an institution, having passed through three distinct stages in its development.

One indication of the success of the Multicultural Concerns Committee is in the shift away from concern for the committee's official status. When the committee was first formed its members thought status as a standing committee would be necessary to exercise the power required to achieve significant change at the college. That status would also be an official recognition of the importance of the issue to the college and to the field of developmental education as a whole. For several years the committee struggled unsuccessfully to achieve that status while working through the existing college governance structure and being actively involved in the recruitment and hiring process. Faculty and staff support for multiculturalism increased gradually through education of existing staff and hiring of new staff. In Fall 2002 the MCC was offered standing committee status by the Policy and Planning Committee, but the MCC rejected this offer, choosing to retain its voluntary membership and activist role. The real success of the committee had eliminated the perceived need for official status.

References

Albrecht, L., & Peralez E. (Eds.). (1990). *Multicultural education seminar for General College teaching faculty & student services personnel.* Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Amram, F. (2003). Personal interview, February 11, 2003.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1996). *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington.

Gardner, L. (2003). Personal interview, February 18, 2003.

Ghere, D. (2003). Author's personal experience, 1992-2003.

Jehangir, R., Yamasaki, M., Ghere, D., Hugg, N., Williams, L., & Higbee, J. (2002). Creating welcoming spaces. In R. Bashaw & A. Rios (Eds.), *Symposium* Proceedings of Keeping our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention *of Faculty of Color.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Kroll, P. (2003). Personal interview, February 14, 2003.

Lewis, C. H. (1989). *Towards a multicultural curriculum.* Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Lewis, C. H. (1990). *Developing an inclusive curriculum: A curriculum guide for multicultural education.* Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Miksch, K. L., Higbee, J. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Bruch, P. L., & Barajas, H. L. (2002). *Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT) 10 guiding principles for institutions of higher education.* Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Multicultural Concerns Committee. (1991). *Final report and recommendations,* May 20, 1991. Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Schmitz, C. C., & Hickey, M. P. (1991). *The effect of ethnic background on General College students' views of the campus climate.* Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). *Culture, difference, and power.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Stewart, B. (Ed.). (1998). [Assorted papers, 1992-1998]. Unpublished raw data. Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee, General College, University of Minnesota.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Taylor, D. V. (2002). Supporting the research mission. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee, (Eds.), *Histories of developmental education* (pp. 7-9). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Taylor, D. V. (2003). Personal interview, February 13, 2003.

White, J. W., & Cones, J. H. (1999). *Black man emerging: Facing the past and seizing a future in America.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC): Sharing Diversity™

A. Ghafar Lakanwal
MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC)
Holly Choon Hyang Pettman
MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC) and University of Minnesota

This article provides a concrete example of applying research, practice, and theory of multicultural education. The MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC) was established in Minnesota in 1991. It is a leader in education regarding cultural diversity for businesses, government, and educational institutions. For 12 years, MCDC has formed partnerships with colleges and universities, such as the University of Minnesota's General College, to bring together the campus and community around multicultural education, research, and sharing resources. MCDC seeks to become a global leader in the field of multicultural education and will continue to serve as a bridge between diverse communities.

For over a decade, the United States has seen dramatic changes in the fabric of our workplace. An increasing percentage of our work force is now comprised of women, people of color, and immigrants. As the workplace and marketplace continue to change, more and more organizations are educating their employees about cultural diversity awareness. An understanding of the issues that arise due to people of different genders, ages, religions, lifestyles, beliefs, physical capabilities, and cultures is needed to bring out the best in all of us. The creativity, flexibility, and commitment gained from our interactions with other cultures and peoples will empower us all.

The workplace is changing, and we are called to strengthen the fabric of our organizations and of our lives by "Sharing Diversity." "Sharing Diversity" is a trademarked concept developed by Dr. Lakanwal, Executive Director of the MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC), which promotes the sharing and understanding of multicultural resources as a means for all of us to prosper. The MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC) is a leader in the area of education regarding cultural diversity. Formerly called the Minnesota Cultural Diversity Center (MCDC), the change in name signals a new global direction for MCDC. As a leader in raising diversity awareness and serving as a catalyst to advance diversity-related issues in Twin Cities workplaces and communities for over a decade, both the executive leadership and board of directors of MCDC recognized the need to extend the organization's reach beyond its local boundaries. Thus a change was made in the name as well as the mission statement.

MCDC's mission is to promote cultural understanding and inclusiveness to enhance workplace performance and community relationships. Through its many programs, thousands of participants gain new understanding and knowledge regarding the many, yet very rich cultural and ethnic heritages that make up the world in which we live. The goal of MCDC is to help build a culture of acceptance and celebration where the attitudes and actions of people foster mutual respect so that people of all different backgrounds can fully participate in the workplace as well as in the community. In learning about our "differences," MCDC

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

believes we will see and understand our similarities, giving us a new foundation to build relationships based upon respect and understanding, not fear, intimidation, or guilt. Underlying all services is an emphasis on respect for individual and cultural difference, including people of every nationality.

History of the MCDC

MCDC is a result of efforts in early 1991 to find a method to address the difficulties of diversity in employment, communications, misperceptions of cultures, and misunderstandings of historical characterization. A concept of solving resistance to cultural diversity in the workplace and in the community was developed. Out of adversity and diversity came the forces for change. Through discussion with the ethnic Chambers of Commerce and several major corporations, MCDC was established as a non-profit organization. From this start the program of "Sharing Diversity" through education and cultural communication was formed.

The MultiCultural Development Center (MCDC) has grown from seven initial members to over 300 members in 2003. Due to adversity issues in the workforce related to cultural differences, communication misperceptions, and the lack of understanding of various cultures, MCDC was established as a resource for business, government, and educational institutions to help foster understanding. MCDC emerged out of the need to educate and help individuals and organizations promote inclusiveness and multicultural understanding through cultural learning, workshops, seminars, conferences, sharing diversity resources, and by providing networking opportunities. Over a decade later, it has grown into an organization that continues not only its educational activities, but also provides consultations and support services to organizations that are starting their own diversity initiatives. MCDC has helped many organizations by leading them into the various phases of the diversity process.

Executive Director

MCDC's Executive Director, Dr. A. Ghafar Lakanwal, was one of the original founders of the organization. Holding a Ph.D. in situational analysis, Lakanwal was formerly the head of the delegation from Afghanistan to the United Nations. He served as Minister of Agriculture of his country and was under house arrest for two years because of his opposition to the former Soviet-backed government. Dr. Lakanwal is a practitioner, event coordinator, and a speaker in the area of cultural diversity. He has traveled to over 30 countries and speaks English, German, Russian, Persian, and his native language, Pashtoo. Dr. Lakanwal serves as a Board Member of the Council of Asian-Pacific Minnesotans. In 1997 Dr. Lakanwal was presented with the Exemplary Practices Award from the American Society for Public Administration. In 2001 he was the recipient of the Omar Bonderud Award given by the Human Rights Commission of the City of Bloomington, MN. In 2002 Mayor Kelly appointed him to lead an advisory committee on cultural relations in St. Paul.

Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of MCDC is comprised of a variety of experts in all areas related to diversity in the workplace, ethnic diversity issues, cultural activities, and socio-economic and political structure. All Board members are committed to understanding each other's differences and respecting the values and customs to ensure that what makes everyone different can also bring everyone together. There are currently 11 elected Board members. Board members are encouraged to attend the monthly cultural learning events, and participate in other MCDC-related activities and events. The MCDC Board consists of people with diverse backgrounds, including African Americans; Asian Americans; Chicano-Latino(a)s; European Americans; Native Americans; gays and lesbians; women; persons with disabilities; and public, private, and non-profit sector employees.

One of MCDC's Board members and volunteers, Holly Choon Hyang Pettman, came on board with MCDC as the youngest member in 1997 and became a Board member in 1998. Ever since that point of time, Holly has provided her expertise and energy toward promoting unity among all people regardless of their diverse background through volunteering at MCDC's various events and activities. However, one contribution that made her unique is she brought forth some very important issues that addressed the future of the next generation. As a student, Holly thought it was critical that MCDC should be more aware of working with young people and help bridge the gap that exists

between educational institutions and the workplace. She was instrumental in establishing a new initiative, "Practicing Diversity in Schools" (PDS), which will promote the work in multicultural education and practice among educators, teachers, administrators, and students within all levels of the educational system. As a Korean American adoptee who was raised in a small, rural Minnesota town, Holly has had many positive role models and mentors in her life who have helped her along the way. Holly currently works full-time in the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL) in General College at the University of Minnesota and is pursuing her Bachelors of Art degree in Sociology with a minor in Psychology. She recently received MCDC's 2002 "Sharing Diversity" Volunteer of the Year award and the 2003 President's Student Leadership and Service Award at the University of Minnesota. She has also facilitated various partnerships and activities between MCDC and departments on the University of Minnesota campus as well as in the community.

Programs

MCDC offers a variety of programs including monthly cultural events, workshops, and seminars. Participants experience different cultures by learning about their food, music, art, literature, geography, socioeconomic and political structures, and more. The impact of these programs is felt throughout the community. Many large, Fortune 500 companies, as well as many private and public businesses, state and local government, and education and community organizations have participated and benefited from MCDC services.

Monthly Cultural Learning Events

Food, music, art, literature, geography, and history blend together to focus on a single aspect of diversity. These events are open to members and nonmembers as well as students. An event that was coordinated by Holly Pettman, MCDC Board Member, was the Korean Heritage Celebration that took place in May 2002. This event included a panel of Korean adoptees to talk about their experience with adoption as well as an array of music, food, and dance. A Tae Kwon Do exhibition and a spoken word performance by local Korean Americans were also a few highlights of the program. Approximately 200 individuals from various corporate, business, and community organizations were in attendance.

Quarterly Workshops and Seminars

These educational events focus on a wide variety of workplace- and community-related issues and are also open to members, nonmembers, and students. Recent workshops included "Cultural Complementarity," "Unlearning Racism, and "Measuring Diversity." All workshops and seminars are conducted by individuals from the local community as well as the national community.

The Annual MCDC Diversity Conference

Broadcasted live via satellite, MCDC partners with public and private sponsors to bring the Annual MCDC Diversity Conference to the public. For example, on October 10, 2002, the Ninth Annual Diversity Conference was broadcasted live throughout the state and nationally from the Minnesota World Trade Center in St. Paul. The title of the conference was "Conquering the Fear, A Process for Healing," featuring Dr. Joseph L. White, Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Psychiatry from the University of California, Irvine. The purpose of the MCDC diversity conference is to help increase viewers' awareness of diversity issues within organizations as well as the communities in which they live. Annually, over 1,500 participants view the conference in over 30 locations nationwide.

Chronology of World Cultural Events Poster and Pocket Calendar

The colorful, 12-month calendar of events is used by organizations as an effective tool for creating awareness of the many events that are important to people from cultures around the world. Schools have begun using it in social studies classes to illustrate national and international celebrations, religious holidays, and other special days.

Organizational Assistance

MCDC facilitates successful implementation of diversity initiatives or programs. This assistance includes supplying information on ethnic and cultural groups and events, providing referrals or connections to many resources, as well as organizing artists and speakers.

Connections

MCDC is connected to ethnic organizations throughout the community. MCDC has a program that provides relocated employees with connections to their ethnic communities.

Publications

MCDC publishes items such as the *MCDC News*, a newsletter focusing on cultural diversity, and the *Cultural Diversity Almanac*, a resource bulletin.

Partnerships with Colleges and Universities

MCDC has formed partnerships with various community-based organizations and educational institutions. For the past 12 years, MCDC has worked with the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MNSCU) system, University of St. Thomas, and Hamline University to bring many educational activities such as conferences, workshops, seminars, and public forums to their campuses. We have a formal long-term relationship with the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to bring the annual video conference to its over 30 technical and community colleges. We have also worked with General College, a leader in developmental education, and other units of the University of Minnesota to broadcast MCDC's annual conference to University sites.

MCDC has recently partnered with the General College at the University of Minnesota under the leadership of Dean David Taylor in many areas including sharing multicultural resources, speakers, and presenters in different areas of diversity. Both organizations will share research and information on multicultural education, participate in cultural learning events, and provide other multicultural services to promote cultural understanding and inclusiveness on campus as well as in the community at large. Both organizations are focusing on actions that will bring tangible results, which will encourage others on campuses to follow.

Future

Moving forward, MCDC is committed to continuing its work providing the opportunity for learning through the various educational and training programs including the new initiative "Practicing Diversity in Schools," with the hope of transforming cultural difference into strengths, a process from which everyone can benefit. Through collaborations with General College and other educational institutions, more visible learning events will be planned to reach broader audiences. Further information is available at www.mcdc.org.

Summary Report on the Third National Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education: Grants, Research, Diversity, and Multiculturalism

Dana Britt Lundell
University of Minnesota

This report summarizes the proceedings and outcomes of the third Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education. On November 16-17, 2002, 40 participants met in Minneapolis, Minnesota, to follow up on the initiatives of the first two national meetings. The meeting followed two theme tracks: brainstorming grants and research, and promoting diversity and multiculturalism research in developmental education. Outcomes included developing ideas for grants and research and a national initiative for diversity and multiculturalism in developmental education.

In a continuation of two past meetings on "Future Directions in Developmental Education," co-sponsored by the University of Minnesota-General College and the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL), 40 regional and national leaders met a third time on November 16-17, 2002. This summary report outlines the background, proceedings, and outcomes of this meeting, with a focus on future initiatives for the field.

The first meeting in October 1999 included 20 regional and national leaders with expertise in access issues for students transitioning into postsecondary education programs. They identified 16 themes, including histories of developmental education, future research, and theoretical frameworks. Participants met to brainstorm and create recommendations. Four major themes emerged in the first meeting: research, policy and practice, collaboration and community partnerships, and theoretical perspectives. A second meeting was held in April 2001 to expand upon those and recommend future action. Proceedings of past meetings are available on CRDEUL's web site (http://www.gen.umn.edu/research/crdeul/publications.htm).

At the third meeting in November 2002 participants continued conversations around two themes: grants and research, and diversity and multiculturalism. This time 40 leaders from a variety of subject areas and organizations met to develop specific action plans for the coming year. The meeting's outcomes included identifying grants and research topics as well as future directions for multiculturalism and diversity in developmental education. Action plans were also developed as part of this meeting, intended to focus more specifically on the means toward achieving change in these defined issues.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grants and Research

In an increasingly conservative political climate that continues to erode away at progressive programs and policies, such as developmental education and higher education student access initiatives, a group of 20 leaders at the third Future Directions Meeting met specifically to address future needs in the areas of grants and research. Facilitators of this session were David Arendale, David Caverly, and Dana Britt Lundell. This theme track focused on brainstorming topics, prioritizing interests, defining potential grants collaborations, and developing significant research questions.

Topics

In the brainstorming session, participants developed the following list of potential topics for future grants and research. This list is intended to provide ideas for future studies, while simultaneously demonstrating the rich cross-section of research interests represented by leaders from across the nation and from various developmental education organizations. Participants recommend that these kinds of studies be developed, with particular attention paid to responsively and creatively addressing current political trends and involving a range of program types where appropriate. The list is presented here in full to provide a broad range of ideas broadly to anyone interested in engaging in meaningful work in the field.

- Access and Urban Literacy
- Diversity and Multiculturalism
- Adult Literacy
- Assessment, Evaluation, and the Culture of Assessment
- Partnerships (two- and four-year, P-16 programs)
- English Language Learners and Developmental Education
- Research Methodology
- Evaluation Models, their Adaptability, and Dissemination of Local Research
- Defining and Assessing Learner Outcomes
- Training and Professional Development
- History and Information Gathering about the Profession
- Certification Initiatives, Dissemination and Archiving
- National Dissemination Tools, Evaluation Documents, Resources, Databases
- Faculty Development and Teaching Certification
- Disability Research
- Developmental Education across two- and four-year Programs
- Role of Administration, Attitudes and Knowledge, Professional Development
- Developmental Education and its Impact on Students' Lives In and Out of Programs
- Qualitative Studies About Students and Programs
- Access Research in the Sciences
- Mentoring and Developing New Professionals
- Developmental Education and Connections to Higher Education Initiatives
- Cognitive Processes and Instructional Methods
- Economic Impact of Developmental Education
- Development of a National Center for Student Learning
- Institutional Research, Policy and Funding
- Connection of Developmental Education to Mainstream
- Academic Professionalism and Disseminating Information about Best Practices
- Politics and Data-Driven Decisions (Trend Towards Evidence-Based Policies)
- Increasing Numbers of Developmental Education Students Nationally

Priorities

In the next session, grants and research participants prioritized these lists and identified patterns that related more specifically to their own areas of interest and expertise. These included partnerships, dissemination and information, assessment, national studies, training, status of the profession, and interdisciplinary research.

Partnerships. There is a need to develop multi-site, multi-regional partnerships in future grants and research. There have been no broad-based national research studies in the field conducted since the National Study of Developmental Education (Boylan, Bliss, & Bonham, 1997), and this scale of project is important to continue to update information and knowledge about student learning and the profession. It will be important to add to the recent work on best practices (Boylan, 2002) by providing updated

information about the impact of these practices on students. Additionally, the formation of multi-level (two-year, four-year, P-16) collaborations are important to develop, specifically in response to current and future political trends that target various portions of this continuum. Researchers and partners must also become more informed about the trends in federal and state funding, as well as learning about private foundations and their role and history of supporting access initiatives.

Dissemination and information. The collection and archiving of paper and electronic documents central to the field's work is becoming increasingly important to address. The changing definitions and evolving nature of the work of educators challenge the act of gathering and disseminating information, especially as it relates to grants and research. Areas such as evaluation, history, theory, resources, research, and best practices are some examples of the kinds of issues at the foundation of access education. Determining the best way to consolidate and make this information useful and accessible in a variety of formats is a challenge that needs to be addressed. There are presently a variety of sites that house statistics on higher education (e.g., U.S. Department of Education), centralize and categorize research [Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)], and historical works (Martha Maxwell Library at National Louis University), as well as publications sponsored by various organizations [(National Association for Developmental Education (NADE), College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE), CRDEUL, and the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition]. However, there is no central place to help navigate, organize, or locate a seminal collection of documents that inform and define the past and present work of developmental educators at this point in time. Finding appropriate models and establishing the need for this kind of resource base may include developing a national, electronic database or clearinghouse for developmental education and access research and continuing collaborations across institutions to discuss the future of this concept.

Assessment. There is a need to establish developmental educators as national resource experts on assessment. This would require creating more opportunities for professional development related to evaluation and assessment. Given the current political situation, with "standards" and "evidence-based practice" at the forefront, developmental education as a field needs to become more proactive in evaluating itself and also responsive in addressing these concerns. Developing an initiative that would simultaneously help centralize resources and train educators can enhance the field on multiple levels. Additionally, formulating a response to the current language about assessment is an appropriate step for the field to address.

National studies. It is time for the field to develop more research that connects with the larger conversations and organizations in higher education, as well as international access education. Terms like "access" also need to be revisited as a central concept for developmental education as it relates more specifically to social issues, multicultural education, and political trends. Studies can be devised that connect developmental education programs, theories, and pedagogies to this broader conversation, demonstrating the strength of developmental education work for all of higher education. More research also needs to be designed to assess student standpoints on the impact of postsecondary access programs, especially focusing on diversity issues across the curriculum. Finally, the strengths, design, and wide visibility of projects such as the National Center for Developmental Education's research studies (Boylan, Bliss, & Bonham, 1997) need to be continued and complemented with current investigations into access issues for students, teachers, administrators, and student support services.

Training. Another interest in the grants and research group was professional development and mentoring issues. New professionals in the field require mentoring along the continuum of their work in developmental education, from graduate school through their various professional positions. Establishing models for mentoring that can support individuals and also enhance the quality of students' education and higher education programs is an important step for future work in the field. Specifically, mentoring is a concept that is advocated widely for students entering higher education and in high schools, but it is not as widely accepted or enacted for developing professionals. The positive models we apply to our students should also be part of our discussion about emerging professionals. Mentoring also needs to be assessed and implemented, and effective structures need

to be developed for professionals as well. Another discussion about training revolved around certification of professionals in developmental education, focusing on the status of the profession and future of the field. These activities have been explored, but perhaps more discussion is needed about the appropriateness and desirability of establishing more certification opportunities for developmental educators.

Status of the field. Another key issue is the ongoing exploration of the field's status and definition, particularly in these conservative political times. How do we maintain our visibility as a profession in higher education? What is our connection to other higher education organizations? Should the individual professional organizations in developmental education consider more collaboration or a possible future merger? These are not simple questions with easy answers, but they remain a priority for leaders in the field. Specifically, finding ways to influence policy makers who must consider difficult legislative questions related to budgets and programs in higher education is an ongoing concern. Through the visibility of larger grants and national research projects, information can be gathered that addresses larger questions about students and the impact of these programs.

Interdisciplinary research. Another priority among participants was a conversation about increasing the interdisciplinary research in the field, particularly across content areas and also across other domains in higher education that focus on access research. For example, creating collaborations across science programs that emphasize teaching and learning strategies for students in two- and four-year programs can provide a way to articulate the applicability of sound pedagogies in fields that are not traditionally viewed as providing developmental education. Promoting examples of how the processes used to support student learning can effectively span the continuum and cross disciplines is an important future step for the field to begin to articulate its own connection to other areas of higher education. Expanding theoretical frameworks about teaching and learning is a central component of this kind of initiative, and this is an example of a strength that developmental educators have to offer higher education. Designing cross-institutional, multi-regional research studies and model demonstration projects is an important step for educators to take in forwarding the work of the field and increasing its visibility among policy makers.

Collaborations

After participants in the grants and research strand prioritized these ideas, they formed work groups from across institutions and programmatic types to brainstorm and develop significant researchable, and potentially fundable, questions. Six groups formed, including the following: (a) teaching and learning in the sciences, (b) assessment and evaluation, (c) student learning and professional development, (d) P-16 collaborations, (e) national studies, and (f) dissemination and information.

They developed their topics around five questions:

1. What is the idea?

2. What is the need?

3. What are the benefits?

4. What is the cost?

5. Who is the audience?

Action plans were developed in each of the six groups, emphasizing the need for investigations of future funding opportunities and national, cross-institutional research collaborations. The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL) will continue to follow up with participants and pursue relevant projects in partnerships at the regional and national levels.

Diversity and Multiculturalism

During the November 2002 Future Directions Meeting, a second thematic strand met to discuss diversity and multiculturalism, with the goal of developing an action plan for a national initiative on these issues. Facilitators in this theme track were Jeanne Higbee, Karen Miksch, Rashné Jehangir, and Holly Choon Hyang Pettman. The focus points for this group included the following questions:

1. How do we define multiculturalism and diversity for developmental education?

2. How do we foster the principles of multiculturalism according to Dr. James Banks (Banks, 1994, 1997; Banks, Cookson, Gay, Hawley, Jordan Irvine, Nieto, Ward Schofield, & Stephan, 2001) in

developmental education programs (e.g., positive intergroup relations, prejudice reduction, developing equity pedagogies, knowledge construction, content integration, empowering school and social structure)?

3. How do we promote the centrality of theory, research, and pedagogies of multiculturalism within developmental education?

4. What issues are most salient for our student, faculty, and staff populations?

5. How can we enhance the visibility of multicultural issues in national organizations?

6. What kinds of multi-institutional and multi-disciplinary collaborations can develop to promote these issues in our field in the areas of grants, research, teaching, and professional development?

7. What are some barriers and challenges for promoting multiculturalism in the field?

Participants in this strand brainstormed these questions as a whole group and then broke into work groups around topics they established related to developmental education. As a result of the conversations in the diversity and multiculturalism sessions, a national initiative, titled Future Directions Multicultural Initiative (FDMI), was launched by Jeanne Higbee, CRDEUL's Faculty Advisor, with the assistance of graduate research assistant Kwabena Siaka. This project focuses on information dissemination, curricular transformation, and research.

Conclusion

In addition to Higbee's FDMI project, Dana Britt Lundell will lead the CRDEUL Advisory Board in the development of future research and best practices in developmental education, following up on the initiatives from the grants and research group. Specifically, the focus will be on encouraging collaborations with institutional partners across the nation. Future versions of the 2002 Future Directions meeting will include follow-ups as needed with a small group of leaders to continue the work and assessment of the action projects.

In conclusion, CRDEUL would like to thank the participants at the Third Future Directions Meeting: Carol Bader, Lois Bollman, Nancy Bornstein, Hunter Boylan, Thomas Brothen, Patrick Bruch, Martha Casazza, David Caverly, Herbert Chambers, Frank Christ, Carl Chung, Terence Collins, Mary Deming, Irene Duranczyk, Shevawn Eaton, David Ghere, Susan Hashway, Jeanne Higbee, Leon Hsu, Nancy Hugg, Walter Jacobs, Rashné Jehangir, Karen Kalivoda, Ann Ludlow, Dana Lundell, Barbara Lyman, Ross MacDonald, Karen Miksch, Randy Moore, Jane Neuberger, Emily Miller Payne, Holly Choon Hyang Pettman, Bruce Schelske, Sharyn Schelske, Norman Stahl, Gretchen Starks-Martin, David Taylor, and Cathrine Wambach. We also thank all CRDEUL Advisory Board members and CRDEUL staff for their work and contributions to this meeting.

References

Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1997). Transformative knowledge, curriculum reform, and action. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 335-346). New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Jordan Irvine, J., Nieto, S., Ward Schofield, J., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, School of Education, University of Washington.

Boylan, H. (2002). *What works: Research-based best practices in developmental education.* Boone, NC: Continuous Quality Improvement Network with the National Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University.

Boylan, H., Bliss, L., & Bonham, B. (1997). Program components and their relationship to student performance. *Journal of Developmental Education, 20* (3), 2-4, 6, 8.

Report of the Future Directions Meeting Multicultural Theme Track

Jeanne L. Higbee
Holly Choon Hyang Pettman
University of Minnesota

This chapter reports on discussions within the multicultural theme track of the 2002 Future Directions Meeting sponsored by the General College at the University of Minnesota. Three separate conversations addressed political action, curricular transformation, and research initiatives.

In November 2002 a group of developmental educators from throughout the United States convened in Minneapolis at the Future Directions Meeting sponsored by the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL). A primary goal of this meeting was to discuss the centrality of multiculturalism to the practice of developmental education. During previous Future Directions Meetings (Lundell & Higbee, 2000, 2002) this topic had emerged as one of vital concern to the profession. Representing multiple professional organizations, including the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE), the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), and the National College Learning Center Association (NCLCA), as well as regional and state organizations, these educators perhaps posed more questions than provided answers, but the questions raised are critical to the field. The group began with a brainstorming session to generate specific questions and issues to be addressed during the meeting.

Among the initial questions were:

"How do we define multiculturalism?"

"What is the difference between diversity and multiculturalism?"

"How does diversity benefit higher education? Who benefits?"

"Given changing demographics, how do we redefine terms like 'minority'? What new terminology will be used to describe the new majority?"

"Who determines how we identify 'the brightest and the best'? The best at what? In what way the brightest?"

"How do we avoid bestowing power and privilege only to those who fit the academy's preconceived notion of what it should and always has looked like? How do we change perceptions of what the academy should look like?"

The group proposed that we need to reconsider the term "inclusion." What do higher education institutions, and developmental education programs in particular, *do* to enable students to feel included? How do we communicate that we welcome diverse voices and that we value the contributions of all students? How do we determine who has access, who is included? Are traditional measures such as standardized admissions tests valid indicators of students' potential? How do we recognize the breadth of students' abilities, their multiple "Discourses" (Gee, 1996; Lundell & Collins, 1999), and their ways of knowing?

Another important and related topic for this conversation was how to make learning and knowledge accessible to diverse learners. Several questions arose around connections between academia and other

aspects of society. For example, why are higher education institutions so unwilling to validate the successes of popular culture? Why are educators averse to facilitating learning by following the example of pop culture? Why do academics belittle teen culture instead of attempting to meet students half way? Why do many faculty members consider their own, traditional path to be the only legitimate road to understanding? Instead of providing access, some developmental education programs erect additional barriers for students. What policies and practices in developmental education facilitate diversity, and what policies and practices serve to exclude students disproportionately on the basis of race, ethnicity, home language, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, or any other factor used to categorize human beings? This meeting provided a launching point for developmental educators to begin identifying about the politics and practices of diversity and multiculturalism for programs and their students, faculty, staff, and administrators. What can the profession of developmental education draw upon to enhance its own work in diversity and multiculturalism while also making connections and contributing to the work of other educators?

The Multicultural Mission of Developmental Education

Developmental education can place itself at the forefront as a leader in promoting equality in higher education. Right now politicians around the country are critical of developmental education costs and outcomes (Saxon & Boylan, 2001), and in several states have been successful in eliminating developmental education from public four-year institutions. Developmental educators need to unite to create a vision that places developmental education at the center of efforts to keep the democratic promise of education for all. Given shifts in the distribution of labor, postsecondary educational opportunity must become a reality, and not just for those who are already privileged. Developmental educators must speak with a unified voice, and that voice must advance the centrality of multiculturalism, not only within developmental education, but within every other aspect of our daily lives. Some of the same arguments and language that are currently used in opposition to the provision of developmental education programs and services (e.g., terms like "standards" and "excellence") must be used in support of creating systems of higher education that are accessible and inclusive. Elitism in higher education is counter-productive, not only to the stated goals of the democratic ideal in the U.S., but from a global perspective as well, in an era when nations should be working together to eradicate illiteracy.

How do we establish a unified voice when there appears to be so much disagreement both within and between professional organizations in developmental education and learning support? Participants decided on three interrelated agendas: (a) articulating and communicating a multicultural vision for developmental education, with both an informational and a political agenda; (b) developing a model for curricular transformation; and (c) creating a plan for research and publications to educate a variety of constituencies about the centrality of multiculturalism to developmental education and to higher education in general.

Guiding Principles as a Starting Point

The Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT; Miksch et al., in press) subcommittee of the University of Minnesota General College's Multicultural Concerns Committee (MCC) has adapted Banks et al.'s (2001) *Diversity Within Unity: Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society* to higher education. With permission, the group had modified Banks et al.'s 12 "essential" principles for elementary and secondary (K-12) education to create nine "guiding" principles for postsecondary education. Although participants in the Future Directions Meeting found the new set of principles to be timely and relevant, they pointed out that the principles failed to address the question of access. All children in the U.S. are supposed to have access to K-12 public education. Our current President's well-publicized motto is "Leave no child behind," but for some reason it is acceptable to leave our adolescents behind. How can we abandon our young people at this critical juncture? The MAP IT group agreed to develop a tenth guiding principle, which later was prioritized to appear first, to reflect the necessity of providing access in order to ensure multicultural learning experiences in higher education. This addition reflects an important statement that access is not only central to developmental education, but across the entire K-16 continuum as well. The revised guiding principles

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Higbee, Bruch, Jehangir, Lundell, & Miksch, 2003; Miksch, Higbee, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, & Barajas, 2003) are as follows:

Institutional Governance, Organization, and Equity

1. The educational institution should articulate a commitment to supporting access to higher education for a diverse group of students, thus providing the opportunity for all students to benefit from a multicultural learning environment.

2. The educational institution's organizational structure should ensure that decision making is shared appropriately and that members of the educational community learn to collaborate in creating a supportive environment for students, staff, and faculty.

Faculty and Staff Development

3. Professional development programs should be made available to help staff and faculty understand the ways in which social group identifications such as race, ethnicity, home language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, social class, age, and disability influence all individuals and institutions.

Student Development

4. Educational institutions should equally enable all students to learn and excel.

5. Educational institutions should help students understand how knowledge and personal experiences are shaped by contexts (social, political, economic, historical, etc.) in which we live and work, and how their voices and ways of knowing can shape the academy.

6. Educational institutions should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively within a multicultural educational community.

7. Educational institutions should enable all students to participate in extracurricular and co-curricular activities to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enhance academic participation and foster positive relationships within a multicultural educational community.

8. Educational institutions should provide support services that promote all students' intellectual and interpersonal development.

Intergroup Relations

9. Educational institutions should teach all members of the educational community about the ways that ideas like justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity are valued by many cultures.

Assessment

10. Educational institutions should encourage educators to use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess student learning.

This discussion led to a broader conversation about institutional mission statements. How many institutions of higher education address multiculturalism when considering their overall mission? One reason that institutions might avoid any mention of diversity in their mission statements is the belief that affirmative action is no longer necessary, that the era has supposedly passed when we needed to work to overcome the effects of past discrimination in employment and segregation in education. Participants agreed that, considering prevailing attitudes, another approach might be for institutions to make a commitment to serving all groups of students. One challenge facing developmental education programs is how to serve underprepared students without segregating them.

Three Task Groups

On the second day of the meeting three groups were formed to develop action plans, with the goal of using these plans as a road map for future work in developmental education.

Political Action

The political action group proposed developing position papers related to the centrality of multiculturalism within higher education and developmental education in particular. The group suggested that the American Council of Developmental Education Associations (ACDEA) could take the lead in coordinating this effort with the leaders of member national professional organizations in developmental

education and learning support and also communicate with state systems of higher education and regional commissions. The position statements could also be used to lobby in the political arena.

Another idea generated by this group was to link educational goals to economic impact. Research supports the relationship between educational attainment and economic success. When attrition rates are unequal across different segments of the population, the entire community, whether local (e.g., Taylor, Schelske, Hatfield, & Lundell, 2002) or global, suffers. We need to identify leaders in the business community who can describe how they benefited from developmental education and will serve as role models for today's youth. On the other hand, it is important not to lose sight of the personal benefits of higher education as well, to consider the social and political as well as economic outcomes.

Curricular Transformation

This group discussed the idea of education as a meritocracy in which only a narrow range of skills and knowledge is valued. The entire educational process needs to be more inclusive. The group distinguished between three dimensions of multiculturalism in the curriculum: (a) the celebratory dimension, which may recognize many different cultures and traditions, but often does so through "add-ons" (e.g., African American History Month) rather than by embedding multiculturalism in the curriculum; (b) the critical dimension, which critiques the status quo and examines power differentials; and (c) the transformative dimension, which integrates multiculturalism into the curriculum (i.e., everything should be taught from a multicultural perspective). Members of this group have developed a separate manuscript elucidating these ideas (Bruch, Jehangir, Jacobs, & Ghere, 2003).

Research

The research group identified numerous ideas for research and publications, including (a) a synthesis of the history of developmental education and its role in promoting cultural pluralism in higher education, to be published in a high-visibility periodical like the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that reaches a broader audience; (b) a piece that traces access to higher education in the U.S. from its origins to the present, with recommendations for the future; (c) a review of changing demographics and their impact on higher education; (d) an analysis of high school graduation standards and state-mandated testing programs and their relationship to college preparedness; (e) an exploration of meaningful access to higher education; (f) articles related to multicultural theory and the work that has already been done by multicultural educators; (g) a compilation of best practices in multicultural education and developmental education; (h) interdisciplinary articles; and (i) a study of whether cultural diversity courses make a difference, whether they change attitudes or behaviors. Members of this group have already developed a number of manuscripts based on these ideas (e.g., Bruch, Higbee, & Lundell, 2003, in press; Higbee, in press; Miksch, 2002, 2003, in press) and initiated new research projects. The final chapter (Barajas & Higbee, 2003) of *Curriculum Transformation and Disability: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education* (Higbee, 2003), a recent publication of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, proposes Universal Instructional Design as a potential model for the multicultural transformation of higher education. Responding to a recommendation from the group, CRDEUL has chosen "Best Practices in Access and Retention in Higher Education" as the theme for its next monograph. A call for submissions is available at the end of this publication.

Continuing the Conversation

The Future Directions Meeting was intended as a first step for developmental educators to initiate a meaningful conversation about the intersection of diversity and multiculturalism with current theory, research, and practice within the field. David Taylor, Dean of the General College, has allocated funds to continue the work begun at the Future Directions Meeting through the Future Directions Multicultural Initiative (FDMI). A session proposal titled "Embracing Multiculturalism: A Critical Conversation" has been accepted for the CRLA conference in October 2003 in Albuquerque, and a similar session has been proposed for the 2004 NADE conference in St. Louis to invite broader participation in this conversation. Meanwhile, NADE has established a special committee to explore the future of its Cultural Diversity and International Access Committees (Higbee & Offiah-Hawkins, 2003) and has invited feedback related to the mission and

continued existence of these committees. Further information will be provided throughout the year via the *NADE Newsletter*. Updates on FDMI and MAP IT will be available on the CRDEUL Web site: www.gen.umn.edu/research/crdeul.

References

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). *Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.* Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, College of Education, University of Washington. Available: http://depts.washington.edu/centerme/home.htm

Barajas, H. L., & Higbee, J. L. (2003). Where do we go from here? Universal Design as a model for multicultural education. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 285-290). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Bruch, P. L., Higbee, J. L., & Lundell, D. B. (2003). *Multicultural education and developmental education: A conversation with Dr. James A. Banks.* Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Bruch, P. L., Higbee, J. L., & Lundell, D. B. (in press). Multicultural legacies for the 21st century: A conversation with Dr. James A. Banks. In J. L. Higbee, D. B. Lundell, & I. M. Duranczyk (Eds.), *Multiculturalism in developmental education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R., Jacobs, W., & Ghere, D. (2003). *Enabling access: Toward multicultural developmental curricula.* Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Higbee, J. L. (Ed.). (2003). *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Higbee, J. L. (in press). Critical thinking and college success. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education.*

Higbee, J. L., Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., & Miksch, K. L. (2003). The multicultural mission of developmental education: A starting point. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 19* (2), 47-51.

Higbee, J. L., & Offiah-Hawkins, S. (2003). Invitation to participate in a NADE special committee. *NADE Newsletter, 26*(2), 7.

Lundell, D. B., & Collins, T. (1999). Toward a theory of developmental education: The centrality of "Discourse." In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *The expanding role of developmental education* (pp. 3-20). Morrow, GA: National Association for Developmental Education.

Lundell, D. B., & Higbee, J. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Proceedings of the First Intentional Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Lundell, D. B., & Higbee, J. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Proceedings of the Second Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Miksch, K. L. (2002). Legal issues in developmental education: Diversity as a key element of the educational mission. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 19*(1), 55-61.

Miksch, K. L. (2003). Legal issues in developmental education: The impact of high-stakes testing. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 19*(2), 53-58.

Miksch, K. L. (in press). Legal issues in developmental education: Affirmative action, race, and critical mass. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education.*

Miksch, K. L., Higbee, J. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Bruch, P. L., & Barajas, H. L. (2003). *Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP-IT) 10 Guiding Principles for Institutions of Higher Education* (rev. ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee and Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Miksch, K. L., Higbee, J. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Bruch, P. L., Siaka, K., & Dotson, M. V. (2003). *Multicultural awareness project for institutional transformation: MAP IT.* Minneapolis, MN: Multicultural Concerns Committee and Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Saxon, D. P., & Boylan, H. R. (2001). The cost of remedial education in higher education. *Journal of Developmental Education, 25*(2), 2-4, 6, 8.

Taylor, D., Schelske, B., Hatfield, J., & Lundell, D. B. (2002). African American men from Hennepin County at the University of Minnesota, 1994-1998: Who Applies, who is accepted, who attends? In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Exploring urban literacy and developmental education* (pp. 109-125). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA • General College

The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy

Publication Announcements

Forthcoming

CRDEUL Monograph Series:
Best Practices for Access and Retention in Developmental Education
Available Winter, 2004

Currently Available in Print and Online

Multicultural Awareness Project for Institutional Transformation (MAP IT)

Curriculum Transformation and Disability: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education

CRDEUL Monograph Series:
Exploring Urban Literacy & Developmental Education
Histories of Developmental Education
Theoretical Perspectives for Developmental Education

Please visit our Web site for more information about these and other CRDEUL publications

www.gen.umn.edu/research/crdeul

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Call for Submissions: CRDEUL Monograph Series

Best Practices for Access and Retention in Higher Education

The fifth annually published independent monograph sponsored by the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota, General College.

We encourage and invite educators to contribute to the fifth independent monograph in a series sponsored by the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL). The goal of these monographs is to build strong research and theoretical foundations in the field of developmental education, learning assistance, and access education from the perspectives of teachers, researchers, support services specialists, and students.

The fifth monograph will feature theory, research, and best practices related to promoting access and retention in higher education. Priority will be given to manuscripts that address achievement among populations traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

Articles for this monograph might explore and expand the following questions:

- How can institutions enhance diversity among students, faculty, and staff?
- What factors most consistently contribute to the success of students from traditionally underrepresented populations?
- What types of programs, courses, and services contribute to student retention?
- What kinds of research can address access issues in higher education?
- Which program models best serve students entering college and promote access?
- What practices do students say contribute most favorably to their transition to college?
- What kinds of policy decisions can positively or negatively impact access?

Submissions (see attached form) must be **postmarked by February 1, 2004.**

Manuscripts will be forwarded to the editorial board for peer review. Authors will then be notified regarding the status of their proposals and receive recommendations and feedback by April 15, 2004. Manuscript revisions will be due by June 15, 2004. The final publication goal for this monograph is winter 2004.

Refer to the attached guidelines for authors for further information related to manuscript submission. This information is also available online at **www.gen.umn.edu/research/crdeul**

For further information, contact:

Dana Britt Lundell, Co-Editor, CRDEUL Monograph
Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy
University of Minnesota-General College
333B Appleby Hall
128 Pleasant Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 626-8706
FAX: (612) 625-0709
E-mail: lunde010@umn.edu

Cover Sheet

Best Practices Monograph

Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy
General College, University of Minnesota

Lead Author: _____
(All further correspondence will be directed to lead author.)

Position Title: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Work Phone: ( ) _____ E-mail: _____

Additional Author(s): _____ Institution: _____

Additional Author(s): _____ Institution: _____

Additional Author(s): _____ Institution: _____

Additional Author(s): _____ Institution: _____

(Be sure that each name is written as you would prefer it to appear in print.)

Title of Manuscript (not to exceed 12 words): _____

_____

We, the undersigned, agree to have this manuscript published in the CRDEUL monograph, *Best Practices for Access and Retention in Higher Education*. This manuscript does not duplicate previously published works or articles under consideration for publication elsewhere. We agree to abide by revision decisions made by the co-editors and editorial board. Accepted manuscripts become the property of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy and may not be reprinted without the permission of CRDEUL. Signatures of all authors must appear below.

Signature **Date**

_____

_____

_____

_____

Submit this cover sheet, 5 copies of the manuscript, and 3 mailing labels with lead author's return address to Dana Lundell, CRDEUL, General College, University of Minnesota, 333B Appleby Hall, 128 Pleasant Street SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, by **February 1, 2004 (postmark deadline)**.

Guidelines for Authors

Best Practices in Access and Retention in Higher Education

A publication of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL), General College, and the University of Minnesota.

To be considered for publication, manuscripts must comply with the following guidelines:

1. Manuscripts and reference style must be in accordance with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Submissions that do not comply with APA style will be returned to the author(s).

2. Manuscripts must be typewritten, double-spaced, minimum one-inch margins, regular type face/font, preferably 12 point, no right justification. Do not use boldface type or special fonts. Italics are used instead of underlining for titles and emphasis, including subheadings and in the reference list (see APA handbook, 5th edition, pp. 100-103).

3. The subject must be relevant to the monograph theme.

4. Manuscripts must not duplicate previously published works or articles under consideration for publication elsewhere. All authors will be required to sign a non-duplication agreement.

5. The title page must include the title of the chapter (not to exceed 12 words); the name(s) and institutional affiliation(s) of all authors; and the address, telephone numbers (work and home), and fax and e-mail information, if available, for the lead author. All correspondence will be with the lead author, who is responsible for all communication with any additional author(s).

6. The second page should be an abstract of the manuscript, maximum 100 words.

7. The body of the chapter should begin on the third page, and may range in length from 10 to 30 pages, including all references, tables, and figures. Each page should include the running head and page number in the upper right corner, as described in the APA manual.

8. Any information that might identify the authors, such as names and institutional affiliations, must be omitted from the body of the manuscript. Where appropriate, identifying information will be inserted following the blind review process.

9. Figures and tables must be camera ready, according to APA style, on 8 1/2" x 11" paper, one per page, with figure captions appearing on a separate page. Any figures, drawings, diagrams, or tables must be the original work of the author(s). Only figures and tables that are necessary support to the text will be published.

10. Only references cited in the text may be included in the reference list. Care must be taken to attribute all quotations to their published published sources. Direct citations for quoted work must be provided except in those rare situations when the original source is not available. Direct quotes must be accompanied by citations, including page numbers. The authors are responsible for the accuracy of all citations and references.

11. The only acknowledgments that will be published will be those required by external funding sources.

12. Manuscript authors must agree to abide by revision decisions made by the editors.

13. Upon acceptance the author(s) will be responsible for making required revisions and resubmitting the manuscript on disk.

14. Accepted manuscripts become the property of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy and may not be reprinted without the permission of CRDEUL.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").